

THE  
**Primitive Fathers**  
 NO  
**PAPISTS:**  
 IN  
 ANSWER to the VINDICATION  
 of the *NUBES TESTIUM*.  
 To which is added  
 An Historical Discourse  
 CONCERNING  
*INVOCATION* of *SAINTS*;  
 In ANSWER to  
 The Challenge of F. Sabran the Jesuit.

Wherein is shewn, that *Invocation* of *Saints* was so far  
 from being the *Practice*, that it was expressly  
 against the *Doctrine* of the *Primitive Fathers*.

IMPRIMATUR Liber cui Titulus, *The Primitive Fathers no Papists, &c.*

Ex Aedib. Lamb.  
 Febr. 4. 1687.

Guil. Needham R.R. in Christo Patri ac D.D.  
 Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

LONDON, Printed for Wic. Chiswell at the *Rose and Crown*  
 in *S<sup>t</sup> Paul's Church-Yard*, M DC LXXXVIII.

~~see 65,6102~~

70,6102



---

# THE PREFACE.

**I** Have been so much larger in my Vindication of the Primitive Fathers than I intended at first, that I would not have troubled the Reader with any Preface at all, but that I think it requisite to give him some account of the length of it. In the present Controversy with the Writers of the Church of Rome, we lye under one great unhappiness, which our Forefathers were not troubled with in their Contests with the Romanists; they were wont then fairly to own their Popish Doctrines, and our Authors had nothing to do but to oppose them: but we have not only the disproving of Popery upon our hands now, but must be obliged also to prove the Popery it self upon them: We must now not only prove the Worship of Images to be unlawful, but prove, that they worship Images.

This is that which hath engaged me to be so large, for the Adversary I have to do with is one of the new Stamp, one of the Assertors of the NEW POPERY, who since they see they cannot defend the true old down-right Popery, have set up such a Popery as they think they can defend. Thus when they find how perfectly inconsistent with the Honour of God, and how directly contrary to the Word of God it is to give Adoration or Religious Worship to Images or Reliques; they are for salving all by bearing the Reader in hand that they do not do it: and thus when we shew them that their Purgatory-Fire is not only inconsistent with the Account we have of the State of the Dead in the Holy Scriptures,

A 2

but

## The PREFACE.

but also with the Account of it in the Primitive Fathers for six hundred years, they have no other refuge than to tell us, that they do not hold a Fiery Purgatory.

This dissembling and betraying of their own Popery is that which hath occasion'd my insisting so largely and distinctly upon these points, by which I have effectually shewn, that the Church of Rome doth command and practise the Adoration of Images and Reliques, and that her Purgatory differs only from Hell in the Duration of their Torments.

I did expect and hope I shall reap a double advantage from my care to expose these things; the first of which is to confute my Adversary, and the other to make it evident to the meanest Reader, how very unsincere the Representer is in giving us the true State of their Popery. I am sure, that as to Purgatory, about which he took the most pains to defend himself, I have invincibly proved upon him, that he either did not understand the Doctrine of his own Church, or did most unfaithfully dissemble it.

I hope I need not trouble my self to warn our People of the Confidence with which these Romish Writers can write the most false and most disingenuous things: if Confidence be all that is necessary to carry any cause, I must confess that we should come off losers, because we cannot tell how to imitate these men: however no one is ignorant that a Mountebank is but a Mountebank still for all his pretending to Infalible Cures, to never-failing Remedies.

But we must allow our Adversaries this Assurance, since they have nothing else to set off or recommend their Cause, excepting that which is a consequence of it, their writing with a Contempt of us, and treating us scurrilously; but this we can bear chearfully enough, tho' reproach is uneasy to Mankind, because it does so plainly speak out, that all Scholar-like Arguments are spent, and that they have no other left to encounter us with.

## THE PREFACE.

*Of this we have had a great deal of late, and I have had my share from them; I will not animadvert further on it than to say, that their late Pamphlets against us are so very abusive, as if they had been **Written** as well as **Printed** by the Ditch-side. I do heartily forgive them, and believe all our Writers do, and desire to make no other return to such Treatment, than to offer up hearty Prayers to God, That He would bring into the way of Truth all those who have erred and are deceived, and that He would frustrate the Devices of them, who are endeavouring to deceive others.*

---

THE

---

# THE CONTENTS.

***A**N Account of the Con-  
troverſie about the Poſt-  
ſcript to the Answer to the  
NUBES TESTIUM  
with Sabran the Jeſuit p. 2.*

*— About the Answer it ſelf with  
the Repreſenter p. 4.*

***H**is Vindication of the Nubes  
Teſtium againſt the Answer-  
er, ſhewn to be very weak and  
very defective, from a Cata-  
logue of Twenty ſeven materi-  
al Points and Charges againſt  
him, to which he hath given  
not one word of Answer p. 10.*

***H**is vain attempt to clear himſelf  
about the ſtealing his Nubes  
out of a condemned Author,  
ſhewn to be made up of Confi-  
dence and Falſhood p. 18.*

***F.** Alexandre his Maſter proved  
to be alſo either a Compiler,  
or a Falſifier of the Fathers  
p. 22.*

***H**is Chapters in the Nubes about  
Schism, ſhewn further to have  
been alſogether impertinent  
p. 25.*

***H**is Coldneſs and Diffidence a-  
bout the Defence of his Chap-  
ter of the Supremacy, ſhewn  
from his letting fall the Vindi-  
cation of all the numerous Quo-  
tations upon that Head, exce-  
pting Three, The Defence of  
which is ſhewn to be very vain  
p. 26.*

***H**is Defence of his Chapter about  
Tradition, ſhewn to be merely  
a giving us over again two or  
three Pieces of his Old Teſti-  
monies in the Nubes p. 31.*

***T**hat the Primitive Fathers did  
look upon the Scriptures as con-  
taining and handing down to  
us all matters of Faith, ſhewn  
further from Origen, Gre-  
gory Nyſſen, S. Auſtin, and  
S. Hierom. p. 32.*

***T**hat the Church of England  
doth not ſymbolize with the  
Church of Rome, which gives  
Religious Worſhip to the Saints  
on their Feſtivals, but with the  
Primitive Church, who paid  
them only Civil Honour; pro-  
ved from the Epistle of the  
Church of Smyrna and S.  
Auſtin p. 35.*

***H**is Defence of his Chapter about  
Invocation of Saints, begun  
with Falſification of my Words  
p. 37. and built wholly upon  
that falſe Suppoſal, That I  
had granted Invocation to  
have been practiſed in the  
Fourth and Fifth Ages p. 39.*

***T**he Jeſuit Sabran's Challenge  
about Invocation of Saints,  
accepted and answered,  
Wherein is proved, That the  
Primitive Fathers did not  
practiſe*

## The Contents.

- practise Invocation of Saints, during the Five first Centuries, from the Acts of the Martyrdoms of S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp p. 41. from the Liturgy of the first Christians in Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement's Constitutiones Apostolicæ, & S. Austin p. 42. that the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers for those Ages was directly against, and inconsistent with Invocation of Saints, proved from Ignatius p. 45. from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, and S. Irenæus p. 46. from Clements Alexandrinus, and Tertullian p. 47. from Origen p. 49. from S. Cyprian, and Novatian p. 54. from Lactantius p. 55. from S. Athanasius p. 56. from Hilary the Deacon p. 58. from S. Basil, Gregory Nyssen and S. Ambrose p. 59. from S. Epiphanius p. 60. from S. Chrysostom p. 61. from S. Austin p. 62. p. 62.*
- The Jesuit's Confidence in asserting in both his Letters that all the Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries did teach Invocation of Saints, expos'd p. 65.*
- The Argument for Invocation of Angels and Saints, from S. Ambrose disprov'd p. 67.*
- The Jesuit's Arguments for it answered,*  
*His first from S. Austin,*
- shewn to be directly against himself p. 69.*
- His second from Origen, shewn to be as much, if not more against him p. 71.*
- His third from S. Basil, answered p. 72.*
- His fourth from Gregory Nazianz. answered ibid.*
- His fifth from Gregory Nyssen answered p. 73.*
- His last from Theodoret answered p. 74.*
- Three Differences assign'd betwixt what was practis'd towards the Saints, in the end of the Fourth and Fifth Ages, and what is practis'd towards them by the Church of Rome at this day p. 77.*
- A Challenge to the Jesuit, if he intends to reply p. 79.*
- A horrid blundering Objection of the Representer's about Invocation, displayed and confuted p. 80.*
- The Defence of his Chapter about Reliques, shewn to be disingenuous, and unreasonable Cavilling from S. Athanasius p. 84.*
- The whole of his Vindication upon this Head ruin'd, by the proof of two things: first, That the Church of Rome doth worship Reliques, prov'd from the Council of Trent, from Vasques, and Thomas Aquinas their Oracle p. 85.*
- Secondly, That the Primitive Church did not worship them, prov'd*



## The Contents.

- prov'd from S. Hierom and Austin p. 89.
- The Purgatory of the Church of Rome, shewn to be inconsistent with the Belief of the Ancients about the State of the Dead, from the belief of its being a place of torments* p. 93.
- That the Compiler has forsaken the Doctrine of his own Church by denying it to be a Place of Fire and fiery Torments* p. 94.
- That the Purgatory of the Church of Rome is such a place, prov'd from Bellarmine, from the Council of Florence* p. 98.
- from the Catechism ad Parochos* p. 101. *from the Office for the Dead in the Romish Missal* p. 103. *and from Cardinal Capisucchi's Interpretation of the Prayer in that Office* p. 105.
- His Doctrine of the Three States of Men departed, and of Purgatory, shewn to be unserviceable to the Church of Rome, from S. Austin himself, who first taught it* p. 109.
- That the Antients did pray for those in Heaven, and for those in Hell, prov'd against the Compiler from S. Ambrose,* p. 111. *from the Canon of the Mass it self* p. 112. *and from S. Chrysostom and S. Austin* ibid.
- His great dissingenuity and false dealing about representing our Doctrine about the Eucharist, laid open* p. 113.
- The Insincerity of his Defence prov'd from Point to Point,* p. 116.
- That the Primitive Fathers did believe that the Eucharist does in a proper sense nourish our Bodies, proved from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Isidore of Sevil, &c.* p. 118.
- A digression, wherein is proved that the Editors of Rabanus Maurus's Works have abused the World by putting in things which are not his, and leaving out Books which certainly belong to him* p. 119.
- His forsaking the Defence of his Proofs about Images, shewn to be unavoidable, since they do prove against himself* p. 130.
- Directions to the Compiler if he intend to reply* p. 132.
- A recapitulatory Conclusion, wherein is shewn, in short, how far the Primitive Fathers were from being Papists* 133.

THE




1

---

THE  
**Primitive Fathers**  
NO  
**P A P I S T S :**  
IN

ANSWER to the VINDICATION  
of *NUBES TESTIUM*, &c.



**W**Hat reception *My Answer* to the *Nubes Testium* found among the *Members* of the *Church of England*, I am neither so curious, nor so vain to inquire, the entertainment it met with among the *Romish Party* doth very fully discover that some people were very much galled, and very much incensed at it; for no sooner was it published in Print, than I was told that the Clouds were gathering, and that I should find them break in Thunder and Lightning upon me: I will not trouble the World with the *Stories* and the *Messages* I had sent me about it; but will only assure the *Reader*, that if big words, and great threatnings could have done any good upon me, I had certainly been spoil'd for ever venturing upon *Controversy* again, or even upon defending what I had already written therein.

But upon second thoughts I suppose it was, that my  
B *Adversaries*

The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

*Adversaries* found it would be their best way to treat me as a *Writer*, and that it must be their care to have some sort of an *Answer* made to those severe things I had charged the *Representer* and the *Jesuit* with.

The *Jesuit Sabran* was the *first* that took the Field against me, and reason good; since he had but a small *Postscript* of half a page to encounter; and therefore after *three Weeks* time from the publishing of the *Postscript* at the end of my *Answer* to the *Nubes Testium*, out comes his *Letter* of a Sheet and a half to a *Protestant Lord* in defence of the *Passage* in his *Printed Sermon*, which I had reflected on.

As soon as I saw his *Letter*, I could not but smile to see them begin at the wrong end of my *Book* to answer it, and to see them withal undertake the *Defence* of that thing, in which they were opposed not only by us *Protestants*, but by all the *Men of Learning* in their own *Church*: and therefore I needed not to be much concerned, since I perceived I was engaged with an *Adversary* whom I might answer as fast as I could write, who, instead of acquitting himself fairly of the *first* and *single charge* against him, had blundered ignorantly into several other mistakes; which I resolved to call him to account for, and therefore immediately I wrote him an *Answer*, and got it dispatcht so suddenly at the *Press*, that there was but *one day* betwixt the publishing of his *Letter* to the *Protestant Lord*, and my *Letter* to the *Jesuit* himself in *Answer* to it.

Whether the *suddenness* of my *Reply*, or the discovering to the World of his further mistakes, was the reason of his *passionate Reply*, I cannot tell; however I wondered to see a *Jesuit* who wrote with so much temper in the *first Letter*, and resolved not to be provoked into insulting or scurrilous Language, quite forget himself in the *Reply* he made to my *first Letter*; and in this  
Reply

### *The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Reply* which he published within less than a Week after his so solemn professions unto the contrary to the *Protestant Lord*, to fall into such indecent heats and such scurrilous language; but I can assure him, I was not moved by it, and did as little mind as I did little deserve such impertinent language from him: All my concern was to send him a *second Letter*, and to let him know that I was resolved to make his Ignorance as apparent to the World, as his Sermon had been, and to expose his confident mistakes and his bold untruths about the *fourteenth* and *eighteenth* as well as the *thirty fifth Sermons* of *St. Austin de Sanctis*.

I did in two days dispatch and print, and the next day sent him my *second Letter*; to which I have not since received one word of *Answer*, and I suppose I never shall; and I think that *Jesuit* is by this time convinc'd that it had been better for him to have sat down at first quietly under the reproof given him in the *Postscript* to the *Answer* to the *Nubes Testium*: since he hath by his vain attempt to vindicate himself, betrayed his Ignorance and his weakness so very much to the World, and his *Answerer* hath not omitted (in the *second Letter* especially, wherein he had more room) to expose and publish it to the World, and to convince all Readers what sort of *Adversaries* we deal with at present.

I thought my self obliged to make such a discovery of this *Jesuit* to the World, because I did understand while I was engaged with him, that he does appear wonderfully great in his own Eyes, and was as desirous of being thought a very terrible *Jesuit* to the People in *Wales*, when he went thither, not long since, filled with the design and pleasing thoughts of bringing in the *Welsh Nation* by shoals into the Bosom of the Bishop of *Rome's* Church: but I question not but before this time that Country hath another very different Idea of him and

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

his Learning ; and that they now see that his Ignorance is altogether as great, as the Confidence with which he appeared and made such blustering among them.

While I was thus engaged with *Sabran* the *Jesuit*, the *Representer*, or the *Compiler* of the *Nubes Testium* (for he that wrote *Popery misrepresented and represented*, is the same Person that stole the *Nubes Testium* out of *Natalis Alexandre*) had got something ready against me, and was willing to be the *Jesuit's* *Second* : that they might therefore divert me from meddling any further with the *Jesuit*, who, they could not but see, had grievously overshot himself, and yet if possible, was to make some sort of a creditable retreat ; the same day that the *Jesuit* published his *Reply* to my *first Letter*, the *Representer* also appeared in Print against me, but in *Masquerade*, lest it should look a little ungenerous, to fall two of them, and two such men of wonderful prowess and skill, at the same instant upon one weak and unskilful Writer, if you will believe the *Representer* : and as if he had been *Secretary* to a *Committee* of *Dissenters*, and had Orders to draw up *Articles* of *Popery* against me, he publishes from his *Masters* a *Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church of England*, wherein I am complained of for no fewer than sixteen *Articles* of *Popery* to be found in my *Answer* to the *Compiler* of the *Nubes Testium*.

But I did no sooner see this pretended *Letter* from a *Dissenter*, than I was satisfied, not only of the design, but of the *Author* of it, and to spoil the design I immediately set to answering the *Jesuit*, that so I might put an effectual end to the *Controversie* with him, and thereby be wholly at leisure to attend my new *Adversary* in disguise. I was not deceived in my intentions, for after the sending him my *second Letter*, I have not heard one word of the *Jesuit* since, and now after above six  
Weeks

*Weeks* expectations I think I may have leave to believe that I have done his business, and have wholly rid my hands of the *Jesuit*.

And lest the *Representer* should think I should despise him, because I might not know him in his *Dissenter's Masque*, and that I should disdain to vindicate my self against such a *false* and *groundless Charge*, I was careful in an *Advertisement* at the *End* of my *Second Letter* which I was sending to his *Friend* the *Jesuit*, to let him and the World understand that I knew him notwithstanding his *Disguise*, and that I intended to give him a *speedy Answer* to that pitiful cheat.

I was as good as my word, and did shortly after publish my *Vindication* against the *Popish-Dissenter's Letter*, wherein I shewed the great Knavery, the intolerable disingenuity and frequent Calumnies and Falsifications up and down that *Letter*, by which I am satisfied that I did sufficiently acquit my self, and that if the *Representer* himself be not, yet the World is convinced, that he ought to be ashamed of such mean and contemptible projects of defaming an *Adversary*; that he had much better never to have medled with such a knavish Prank, as that *pretended Letter* was, since this piece of knavery had the fate that attends all such unlawful and disingenuous actions, to do the *Representer* and his *Cause*, now it is displayed, ten times more mischief, than it ever could have done him service, had it continued (as he doubtless hoped it would) concealed; for I can assure the *Representer* that I do not speak my own Opinion, but that of abundance of people who are *competent Judges* of these things, and of a great many *worthy* and *Honourable Persons* too, if I tell him, that he hath by that dissembling Practice quite sunk his Reputation, and is now and will be looked upon as a *Person of no Honesty*, nor *Conscience*: and this I hope will at last convince the  
Repre-



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Representer himself*, that the publishing of that *pretended Letter* hath cost him very dear, hath forfeited *that thing* which every good and honest man values next to his *Life*.

I thought it not improper to give this *State* of the *Controversie* betwixt *me* and the *Romish Jesuit* and *Representer* in relation to that *Answer* to the *Nubes Testium*, which hath been the *Cause* of all the dispute betwixt *us*, since it was published unto the *World*, especially since *those two Persons* will be so much concerned in *this Book*, which I am now writing: and it cannot be ungrateful to the *Reader* to know the *Characters* of *them*, particularly of the *Representer*, who hath made so much noise in the *World*, and is the *Person* against *whom* this *Answer* of mine is chiefly aimed.

For within some time after the publishing of his *Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church of England* against *me*, he was pleased to lay aside his *Fanatical Masque*, and to publish to the *World* in his own Name a formal *Vindication* of his *Nubes Testium* with the pompous Title of *The Primitive Fathers no Protestants*, or a *Vindication of Nubes Testium from the Cavils of the Answerer*.

As soon as his *Book* was brought to my hands, and I had cast my *Eye* on his *Title-page*, I began to suspect that now he had stolen from his *own dear self*, and that we should now be served up again with his 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> *Chapters* of his *Second Part* of a *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, which is no new thing with him; but upon the *Perusal* of his *Book*, I found that *this Title* was only for *Ornament* sake, to help his *Printer* in the *Sale* of *them*, or to use *one* of his own dearly beloved *Elegancies*, that this *Title* is much like his *Bartholomew-Fair-Narrative* at the *outside* of a *Booth*, of which he gives such a *Critical Account* in the *first*  
page



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

7

page of his Preface to his *Third Part of Popery Misrepresented and Represented*, as would make one suspect that the *Representer* uses to be very conversant at that Fair, and that he there pickt up most of those pretty Phrases, and fine Elegancies which appear up and down his Pamphlets, and set them off so very much to the Generality of his credulous Readers.

Well, but tho' the *Representer* did not formally set himself to shew that the *Primitive Fathers* were no Protestants, yet did he not do it effectually enough in vindicating his *Nubes Testium* throughly from the Cavils of the Answerer? this I know is that he will value himself upon, and therefore I come next to examine whether, and how he hath done that.

I must confess that when I saw his Title so promising and his Pamphlet so small, I did expect that he would have kept close to his *Vindication*, and would have come up fairly to me in every point and charge; but when I came to read him, I found him spending page after page in general discourse nothing to the purpose, and roving here and there, first into *Oats's Plot*, then quickly into the *Pulpits*, then back into the defence, nothing but rambling and incoherent Discourse, as if his business had been not to give a fair answer to an Adversary, but to fill up six sheets of paper with something.

After I heard of his Intentions of vindicating the *Nubes*, I did not wonder to find such rambling stuff in his Book, for I very well knew his Ignorance was so great that it would be impossible for him to do it as it did require: the collecting of the *Nubes* out of *Natalis Alexandre*, is no more than what might have been done by a Bookseller's Apprentice, who brought so much learning with him from School, as to be able to understand a Latin Author, and to translate some passages of him into English: But to defend those passages, and to prove  
they

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*they* were not *curtail'd*, nor *abused*, nor *misunderstood*, nor *misapplied*, did require a *knowledge* and *skill* in the *Writings* of the *Fathers themselves* out of whom *they* had been borrowed, and therefore the *Representer* was *here* at a loss, was carried beyond his depth, and was hereby engaged in *Matters* he knew nothing more of than what *he* found in his *Master Natalis Alexandre*, who not foreseeing what answers would be made to his *several quotations* out of the *Fathers* could not set down his *Defences* of *them*, and therefore could not supply the *Representer* in *this Emergency*, wherein *he* was so hard put to it by his *Adversary*.

Yet notwithstanding all this, the *Representer* plucks up a good heart, and what *he* wanted of *Learning* for this occasion, he seems resolved to make up with *Confidence*, and therefore talks with as much assurance in his *Vindication*, as if *he* had the *Fathers* at his *Fingers ends*, and was resolved to carry the *World* before *him*; but since *he* was so hardy as to venture once more into the *Combat*, I think it fit to make up to *him*, and to let him know that I must stop him a while, that we two may fairly and calmly examine what hath been written and said on both sides, and see whether things have been managed betwixt *us*, as might be expected from *those* who understood what *they* were about, and had no other design than to make *Truth* appear, which all men will be ready enough to follow.

At the *end* of *his Book* he tells his *Reader* he hath run through all the *Sections* of *his Answerer* but *one*, and talks as if *he* had been as *particular* and as *substantial* in his *Replies* as any *Reader* could desire; but to let the *World* see the bold disingenuity of this *Representer*, and to display his *Confidence* and his *Ignorance* alike, I must take a *new method* with such a *pretender*, and let the *World* see how much of *my Book* he hath not said one word

word to in defence of the *Nubes*: his dexterity at dropping the defence of his *thirty seven Chapters* of his *Popery Misrepresented and Represented* hath been very well shewn in the *View of the whole Controversie betwixt him and the Answerer*; but such things cannot put him to the Expence of but *one blush*: for in his *Preface* to his *last Piece of Popery Misrepresented and Represented* he stands to it, that as for the *Misrepresentations* no body can prove that *he had not such apprehensions of Popery while he was a Protestant*; And for the *Representations*, no body can prove that *he did not therein give that account of Popery which he had learnt in sixteen years Conversation among the Papists*; and thinks this answer sufficient, and a very good reason why he needed not to dispute: but the World is by this time satisfied, that there is a *better reason* why he did not dispute and defend *his Characters*, which is, because he had not learning enough to do it.

And this perhaps will be his *next answer* to me, that in the *Nubes Testium* he did only represent the *Fathers Doctrine and Opinions*, as he had learnt them in *Natalis Alexandre*, and other *Catholick Writers*: but I will take care to shut up that Door, by letting *him* know, that if he quote the *Fathers themselves*, and either falsify, or misapply, or curtail *their words*, no man else is to be answerable for *them* but *himself*, and that herein he is inevitably put upon defending what he hath quoted, and disputing that such and such is the *true sense* of the words, and the *doctrine* of such or such a Father.

And therefore since I was so very particular in my *Answer* to the *Nubes Testium* as to follow him from passage to passage, and to shew *him* that *such and such passages* were nothing to the purpose, that *others* were falsified, that a *third sort* were misunderstood, and wretchedly misapplied, and gave my reasons and Arguments for it all along; He ought either to have been

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

as particular and fair in *his Vindication*; or since he really was unable to do it, to have got *some Friends* to have done it for *him*; but *he* is for doing all himself, and thinks, I warrant *him*, that *his Vindication* will pass well enough upon the *Generality of Readers*, since it is written with an air of Confidence, and with such an assurance as certainly persuades the *Readers*, that he has the Truth on his side.

And therefore I think the greater obligation is upon me to expose such an affected confidence, and I must beg the *Reader's* pardon if I begin a *tedious* but *new Method* to clear this to the World, and shew these *two things*. First a *Catalogue* of abundance of *material points* and *arguments* in my *Book*, to which *he* hath offered no sort of Answer. Secondly, *The Weakness* and *Vanity* of all that *he* hath said in *Answer* to any parts of my *Book*. The clearing of these *two things* will give a *full Answer* to his *pretended Vindication*, and will also, I do not doubt it, put a full End to the *Controversie* about the *Nubes Testium*, betwixt the *Representer* and *Me*.

As to the *Catalogue* therefore, I will place the *several particulars* as they lye in the *distinct Chapters* and *Sections* of my *Answer*, but must begin with my *Preface*, wherein I charged him in the *first place* with affirming not only what was *false*, but what was more than *he* could know, to wit, that the *Latin* of his *Nubes Testium* was out of *such Editions* as are *most authentick*; since I shewed it to be false from *N. Alexandre's own Confession*; and that he could not know what *Editions* *N. Alexandre* did use, because *N. Alexandre* does not tell the *Readers* what *Editions* he used in his *Work*, excepting *Christopherson's Edition* of *Eusebius*, which all know to be far from being the *most authentick*. To this severe Charge he gives no Reply.

I char-

I charged him also in the Preface with stealing the whole of his *Nubes Testium* (excepting a passage or two) out of *N. Alexandre*. This is not denied by him; and reason good, since every page of my Book did invincibly prove it; which hath so much enraged him against me. I charged him with stealing his Book out of a forbidden Author, every one of whose Volumes used by him in that Plagium had been condemned to the Flames by this present Pope two years before, and with his standing Excommunicate by this Pope for his pains. This he durst not deny any more than the other, since I had reprinted the Pope's Bull it self, by which those Books were condemned, and the Representer for keeping and using them Excommunicated by this present Pope.

In my first Chapter I accused the Compiler first of quoting some passages, as from the 34<sup>th</sup>, 45<sup>th</sup>, and 36<sup>th</sup> Chapters of St. Austin's third Book against Cresconius, which are not to be found in those Chapters. To this I have not one word of Reply. Answer to the Compiler of the *Nubes Testium*, p. 4.

2. In the same page I accused *N. Alexandre* of falsifying a notable passage of S. Austin, and the Compiler of obtruding it upon the World so falsified. To this not a syllable is offered in defence of either of them.

3. I accused *N. Alexandre* with falsifying another passage from S. Austin, and our Compiler with putting it off so falsified. But to this not a word of Reply. Answer to *Nubes Testium*, p. 7.

4. I charged our Compiler, when he was come to the point of the Pope's Supremacy, with giving a false state of that Controversie betwixt us. To this I find no Reply. p. 8, 9.

5. I charged the Compiler with a deluding translation of the Decree of the Council of Florence. To this I meet with no Reply. p. 10.

6. I charged *N. Alexandre* with affirming a gross untruth, in saying the Fathers did with a *Nemine contradicente*, interpret the Rock in St. Matthew to be meant of p. 12, 13.



# The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

St. Peter ; and I charged our Compiler for coming in for his share in it, in saying indefinitely, that the *Fathers teach, that Christ built his Church upon Peter*; whereas I shewed there from *Launoy* and *some Fathers themselves*, that the *Generality* of the *Fathers*, nay the almost *unanimous consent* of *them* was directly against our two bold and mistaken *Asserters* : To this heavy charge our Compiler in *his Vindication* was not able, or forgot to give one word of Reply.

P. 21.

7. I charged the Council of *Florence* of being notoriously guilty, either of *Ignorance* or of *Forgery* in that Decree which they made, and our Compiler quoted for the *Pope's Supremacy* ; but our Compiler was not at leisure to say any thing in defence either of that Council, or himself.

P. 25.

8. I charged our Compiler with citing a passage as out of *S. Basil's Comments on Eisaiah*, which not only is not there, but the direct contrary to it is in that place, and put down from thence by me in my Answer. To this not a syllable of Reply.

P. 26, 27.

9. I charged both *N. Alexandre* and our Compiler of very egregious *disingenuity* about *St. Basil's Epistle*, which I proved was directed to the *Western Bishops*, not to the *Bishop of Rome* in particular ; was sent to beg help and assistance from them, not from the *Bishop of Rome* in particular against *Eustathius*. I proved also that it was not through any Letter from *Pope Liberius*, but through a Letter from the *Western Bishops* that *Eustathius* had formerly recovered his *Restitution* to his See, and that the *Oriental Bishops* did not request that assistance from the *West*, because they had not power enough of their own to have judged and deposed *Eustathius*, but upon a quite different account. To all these particular charges of *disingenuity*, and *cheat*, our Compiler durst not offer at one word of Reply.



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

13

10. I charged *them* with *falsehood* in urging a *passage* P. 27. in favour of the Pope from *Gregory Nazianzen*, which did concern *S. Basil* and not the *Bishop of Rome*, as *Elias Cretensis*, and *Billius* do assure us. To *this* we find *no Reply*.

11. I charged *N. Alexandre* and our *Compiler* with prefixing *impertinent* and *false Accounts* to the *passage* in *Athanasius* about *Dionysius of Alexandria*. *No Answer* is given to *this*. P. 27.

12. I charged *them both* with perfect *Romancing* about the business of *Julius's* taking the *Cause of Athanasius* into his hands, and of his citing him and his *Enemies* to appear before his *Apostolic Tribunal*, and proved that it was *false* in every part of it; I charged the *Compiler* with adding to the *falsehood* in saying *Athanasius* appealed to the *Bishop of Rome*, with contradicting his own *Master* who had written a *Dissertation* in which he shewed that *Athanasius* did not appeal thither, nay with contradicting his own next *Testimony* from *Sozomen*. To this heavy load our *Compiler* has not a *Word* to answer. P. 27, 28, 29.

13. I charged *both of them* with great *disingenuity* in calling *St. Chrysostom's* Letter directed to *Innocentius* his Letter of Request, and with their *forgeries* about his presenting it: I charged *them* with wholly mistaking that affair. To *this* not a Syllable of Answer or Defence. P. 31, 32.

14. I accused *both of 'em* of *Ignorance* and *Disingenuity* for affirming that the *Synod of Capua* had committed to *Theophilus* the Decision of the quarrel betwixt *Evagrius* and *Flavianus at Antioch*, when the contrary was as plain as words could express a thing; for laying that to *St. Ambrose* which he had not said. But *this Charge* wants a Reply as well as the rest. P. 32.

15. I desired an Answer from our *Compiler himself* whether he designed the *passage* from *Valentinian's* Letter to prove the *Bishops of Rome* had power alone, or with other P. 34, 35.

ther Bishops of judging Matters of Faith, and the Cause of Priests or Bishops: and shewed him that if he designed only the latter, he was guilty of trifling, if the former, that he was contradicted by his own Master F. Alexandre and by the Clergy of France. But the Compiler is fullen and was too angry to give an Answer in his Vindication to such an ensnaring Question.

P. 35.

16. I charged our Representer and his Master with a false Assertion in saying the Council of Constantinople did submissively desire the Confirmation of their Decrees from Pope Damasus: but Natalis Alexandre is too far off, and the Compiler too fullen to make a Defence.

P. 36.

17. I charged our Compiler with Impertinence in saying, the Hereticks rejected Doctrines and Practices because they were not in Scripture; I charged his Master with egregious falshood in saying the Hereticks appealed only to Scripture; and shewed them that had either of them read that Chapter, nay but the bare Title of that Chapter which they both quote in Irenaeus in defence of what they so falsely affirmed, they would have been ashamed of what they did; But I cannot find a word of Reply to this.

P. 421

18. I charged our Compiler with Ignorance in Chronology, and with contradicting his Master in the very places he transcribes from, and gave the Instances of his placing Vigilantius in the beginning of the fourth Century, whom his Master and all men of Learning place a hundred Years later; of his placing Damasus and Julius in the Third Century, who lived in the Middle of the Fourth Century; of his putting Victor into the First Century, who flourished not till the Second Century was almost at an end: and lastly, of the gross and intolerable Blunder of putting Acrius in the middle exactly of the First Century, whereas he lived not till Three Hundred years after. Our Compiler in his Vindication wanted not only forehead to defend them, but ingenuity to acknowledge his Mistakes,

*Mistakes*, and therefore thought it were best to say *nothing* about it.

19. I charged him with making use of a *false Translation* of a passage in *Eusebius*. To this not a Syllable of Reply.

20. I charged our *Compiler* and his *Master* with making use of a passage in defence of *their Purgatory*, which was *direct Herefy*. But not a word of Reply to this.

21. I charged Our *Compiler* with abusing *Gregory Nazianzen* by an *ensnaring Translation* of his words. To which our *Compiler* will give us *no Reply*.

22. I charged both *N. Alexandre* and our *Compiler* with abusing and quite perverting a passage from *St Ambrose* by leaving out a *Line* which was connected to it, and would have given *light* to the whole passage. To which *no Reply*.

23. I charged *them both* with misunderstanding, and misapplying *St. Ambrose's* words about *Theodosius*, I charged them of being guilty of the *same* towards all the passages urged by them from *S. Basil*, *S. Chrysostom*, *S. Hierom* and *S. Austin*, but cannot find a word of Reply to this large Charge in our *Compiler's Vindication* of himself.

24. I charged the *Compiler* with *disingenuity* for curtailing and maiming the passage from *Gelasius Cyzicenus* about receiving but a small portion of *Christ's Body* and *Bloud*. To which I meet with not one word of Reply.

25. I laid to his charge either *gross Ignorance*, or *great disingenuity* in saying that the *Jews*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees* and *Theopaschites* had always shewed themselves *Enemies of holy Images*. No Answer to this.

26. I charged the *Compiler* with giving a *false state* of the *Controversie* about *Images*, with palliating in talking only of respect to *Images*, when not only *their Council of Trent*, but that *second of Nice* commanded a *Worship*.

ship of them, and their Index Expurgatorius was so careful to strike out of any Author any thing that did but offer to deny Adoration to Images; nay his own Quotations do prove as far as they are able, that Images were to be adored. But to this I find not one syllable of a Reply.

27. I challenged the Compiler to shew that as they made use of the Figure of the Cross in Constantine's time, so they adored it; that the Antients did adore the Image of the Cross, and paid that Latria to the Image of the Cross, which the Church of Rome doth now say, is due to it. But our Compiler is not at leisure to answer Challenges, and therefore finds it the wisest way to say nothing.

Thus I have given the Reader a Catalogue of a great many severe and very considerable Accusations against our Compiler, and his Master Natalis Alexandre, to which he hath not given one Syllable of Reply, or made any Defence for himself or Master against them, though they be charges that call not only their Learning, but their Ingenuity and Honesty so often into question; should I add to this Catalogue another of abundance of considerable passages in my Book, which I put down to explain the true and genuine sense of the several Fathers, and to confront those curtail'd, misunderstood, misapplied; and abused passages with which he had filled his Nubes Testium, to all which I find no better or more Reply than to the former Catalogue in his pretended Vindication; I should be forced to transcribe almost my whole Answer hither: for this Representer hath a considerable knack of his own to answer Authorities by saying nothing to them; He does not in that whole Vindication bear up fairly to any one Argument, or Authority urged in confutation of him, but knows very well how to fence off any thing that does press home, by stepping out of the way of it, and has got a peculiar Art first of abusing and misrepresenting his

his *Adversaries words or sence*, and then of ridiculing *them*, and making them for to appear *absurd or unreasonable*: and then this must pass for a *full answer*, and a *complete Vindication* of himself.

After such an account of the *Compiler's* giving no answer, nor making any defence against so very many severe charges; and of his skulking, and shifting off all replying fairly to the *rest of my Book*: the Reader will be very desirous to know about *what* it is that the *Compiler* hath employed his *six sheets*, and what he would mean by a *Vindication of himself*, if nothing be said to so very many, and so very heavy charges: I come therefore to satisfy that desire, and to shew the Reader how very well the *Compiler's Answer* deserves the name of a *Vindication of the Nubes Testium from the Cavils of the Answerer*; by which false Title I do not question but it was his design to make people believe that I had only carpt at a passage here and there, and never bore up fairly to him; but this is but one of a great many of *disingenuous tricks* so frequent with this *Writer*, as I have made it already sufficiently apparent from the *Catalogue* of considerable things, to which he hath given not a syllable of Reply; and shall make it much more visible in the following part of my Book, and prove there, that it was the *Representer himself* that was thus guilty of that cavilling, of which he so falsely in his *Title Page* accuses me, that it is he himself that is really guilty of cavilling only and catching at here and there a passage in my Answer: and this will give the World a better knowledge of the *Representer*, and discover with what *disingenuity* and confidence he can both write, and affirm the most groundless things.

I have hitherto given account of that part of my Book, to which the *Representer* hath been pleased to return no sort of answer; I must now undertake my second promise,

D

and



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

and that was to discover the weakness and vanity of all that he hath said in answer to the rest of my Book.

He begins his *Vindication*, and certainly wrote it in a very angry mood, and therefore we must pardon his running out into *generals*, and making such frequent and odd excursions into matters that are wholly foreign to the *Controversie* betwixt *him* and *me*, to which I am resolved to confine my self, tho' his anger would not let *him*, but hurries him so much and so often quite out of his way. I will set aside therefore his *general talk*, in which tho' there is a great deal of malice, yet not one syllable of argument; I am never at leisure to mind or to answer such stuff: but will pass to the first thing he intends to reply to, which is *my charge* against *him* of stealing the *Nubes Testium* out of *Natalis Alexandre*.

He acquaints his *Reader*, that I pretend to discover, that the greatest part of the *Nubes Testium* is in *Natalis Alexandre's History*: but when he is got about a dozen lines lower, then it is come to my discovering, that a great part of his *Testimonies* are in that *History*; and in the next page to his only taking the choice of those great numbers of *Testimonies* that are in *N. Alexandre*, and his adding some others to them: I thought I had told *him* often enough in my *Answer*, and I suppose those who have read my *Answer* to *Nubes Testium* do very well remember, that I do not only prove that the passages of the *Fathers* in the *Nubes Testium* are all of them (except one or two) to be met with in *Father Alexandre*, but that they were all of them stolen from thence: and that I do not charge *him* only with stealing some of his choice *Testimonies* thence, with stealing a great part, or the greatest part of the *Nubes Testium*, but I did in my *Preface* charge *him* more than once with stealing the WHOLE of his *Nubes Testium*, with stealing ALL his Book.



Book out of *Natalis Alexandre*, without once mentioning or hinting at *Natalis Alexandre's History* or Name through the whole Book ; with being the greatest Plagiary that hath appeared on the stage in these times.

And now *what answer* hath he made to all this ? Can he deny that the whole of *his Nubes* is to be met with in *Father Alexandre* ? No, that he does not deny ? can he disprove me, or will he deny that he stole that whole Book out of that *Historian* ? No, he dare not pretend to do that neither ; since every page in my Answer, did to his great vexation prove it upon him : What is it then that he would be at, while he has not the face or confidence to deny the thing ? his business in *his Vindication* about this thing seems to be no other than to cast a mist before *his Reader's Eyes*, to lessen his crime as much as he can, and much more than he ought, by bearing them in hand, that the greatest part only, and soon after, a great part, and (as if he were to lessen and diminish the accusation gradually) in the next page the Choice only of the Testimonies in his *Nubes Testium* were to be met with, and were borrowed from *Natalis Alexandre* : but this trick will not do, nor shall this cheat pass upon any one, that will read us both, since I did from the beginning, and do here again accuse the Representers of stealing implicitly his whole *Nubes Testium* (except a passage or two) out of *Father Alexandre* without once naming whence he stole it.

But perceiving that all this would not clear him, or remove the Imputation of a very great Plagiary, under which he lay, he puts as good a face as he can upon the matter, and now is for assuring his Reader, that he is so far from being offended in being thought [he should have added, and being proved] a Compiler, that he should have thought himself unwise, if he had done more than compile. This is pleasant stuff, and shews what metal some men

The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

are made of, who can make that to be a *Virtue* in *themselves*, which all men else look upon to be a *very great disgrace*: but such men are proof against a thing called *Modesty*, and think nothing more necessary to defend *any* of their *most unaccountable actions*, than by setting a good face to it.

But since *our Compiler* pretends here to the *politick part*, and since he does just after own that *he hath not read the Fathers*, and that it would be *ridiculous for him in his circumstances to have attempted to read them over*; I hope it will not be amiss if I can tell him of *another* and a *better point of prudence*, and that is, that he should not in *his Circumstances* have meddled at all with presenting the World with *such a Collection* out of the *Fathers*: I will also give him my reasons along with it, because *they* that know nothing of the *Fathers themselves* ought not to meddle in *these things*; because *every one* that can translate *Latin* into *English* is not straitways an *Adept*, and fit to be employed, or to employ himself in such things, because *they* that are ignorant of the *Fathers themselves*, must rely wholly upon the *credit* and *honesty* of *those* out of *whom* they collect, and can neither answer for the *genuineness* of the *Authors*, nor the *Sincerity* of the *Authorities*, which *they* take wholly upon trust; nor shew that the *Author* out of *whom* they borrow, did not *misapply* or *misunderstand*, or *abuse* the *Fathers sense*.

These reasons together ought to convince him that his excuse *here* is vain, and that it had been his wisest way not to have meddled with *such business*, since he owns *his Ignorance* in the *Fathers themselves*, and I have shewn him that some things else are requisite for a Mans setting up for a *Collector* of *Authorities* out of *Fathers*, besides the *ability* of translating *Latin* into *English*. But the *Representer* thinking by this time that *he* had got pretty well rid of the severe accusation by the *sleight* and

and art of pleading *guilty*, and giving a knackish turn to the whole Matter, is now got into a merry mood, and cannot but *send me his thanks* for giving the World notice of the Representer's having more Consideration, than to take so much unnecessary pains as to read the Fathers themselves in order to his publishing such a Collection of Testimonies out of them.

I cannot but smile and can hardly keep from laughing out at such a Scene as *this*: well then, since he is for *thanking me* for proving he was so great a Plagiary, I cannot in civility but receive *his* Thanks, and assure *him* withal that I am so very desirous and ambitious of doing things for which I can have thanks from such Friends as he is, that I shall always be at *his* service upon the same account, and at the service of all his Friends (to let him see how grateful I am to him) and will make it *my* business to deserve *his* and *their* Thanks, by finding out where they have been stealing their Books, and publishing *their* Thefts to the World, as often as I can, that so I may have the more of *their* Thanks.

But is *this* Man really serious in giving me thanks in *this* business? Can he be hearty in sending me thanks for the discovery of *that* thing which hath made him ridiculous, and wholly contemptible in the Eyes of all Scholars, and I believe I may add, in the Eyes of all those who have perused my Answer to his *Nubes Testium*? I must profess that I look upon *this* as one of the most extravagant things I ever met with in Print, and that I cannot refrain giving it its true Name, and telling the World that I look upon it to be the very height of Impudence, for a man to be so far from being ashamed, or from blushing at *that* which lays him so open to the World, and makes him to be hift at, and ridiculous to all men, as to thank him for it who made him such an Object of Contempt and Derision.

But

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

But *he* hath something more to urge in *his* Defence, and says *he* had Authority enough for it, since I make *F. Alexandre* himself a Compiler, but never discover the Author made use of by him in his History. Here I would gladly know, how *this* can be any excuse to our Compiler that *F. Alexandre* himself is suspected and believed to be guilty of the same crime: as to the reasons of believing *F. Alexandre* also to be a Compiler, I did urge *this* one that he never, that I could observe, does tell *his* Reader what Editions of the Fathers *he* made use of, nor quotes the Page of the Author above once in a thousand Quotations. This made me reasonably suspect that *he* did not deal with the Fathers themselves, but with Coccius and Bellarmine and such Voluminous Quoters of the Fathers: and I am since much more perswaded, and fully confirmed in the Justice of my Suspicion by the enquiries I have made concerning *him* among Learned Men, but especially from one extraordinary Person, who knows him very well, and hath given me a very good reason why *we* meet with the Greek Fathers always speaking Latin in *this* Historian, and why *he* made use of Christopherson's Latin and corrupt Translation of Eusebius in his History, who lived at Paris, and could not want the convenience of the best Greek and Latin Edition of Eusebius. However it is with *him*, I will offer *F. Alexandre* this choice, whether *he* desires to have the Character of a Compiler, or of a Falsifier of the Fathers: if *he* disdains to be thought a Compiler, I do here engage that I will at any time prove it upon *him* that *he* hath falsified several passages of the Fathers in his History: but if *he* will not endure such an odious Character, *he* must even sit down content with the other.

Upon the mention of the word *stealing*, the Representer is up in a rage again, and is got raving into Oates's Plot, and therefore I must leave *him* swaggering and

and tearing, and doing something worse than *that* for a page and a half, and can rest my self awhile till he is got into his senses again, and returned to the *Controversie* betwixt us two. He then tells his Reader that the other Crime I called him to account for, was for making use of an Author in this Collection, whose Books had been condemned by the Pope two years before.

This Crime he thinks to get clear off very easily, and therefore dispatches it in a very few words. But since, says the *Representer*, for this he remits me to my F. Confessor, I'll e'en see to compound the matter with him as well as I can. And did I then remit him to F. Confessor? Did I remit it to the Confessor to decide whether the Pope had by his Breve condemned *Natalis Alexandre's* Books to the Flames? Did I remit it to him to decide whether the Pope had by that Breve forbidden the faithful of what condition or state soever under the pain of Excommunication immediately incurr'd the keeping or reading any of those Books? Did I remit it to him to decide whether the *Representer*, who had not only kept, but transcribed and Printed part of those condemned Books, had incurr'd or no that severe Sentence of Excommunication, which his Confessor can no more absolve him from, than I can, since the Pope hath reserved that Absolution solely to himself and the Popes of Rome? Every syllable of this is so utterly false and groundless, that I should admire at it in any other Person than the *Representer*.

All that I said in relation to the Confessor was, that this bold contempt of the Pope's Breve seemed to be a trial of Skill about *Infallibility* betwixt the Compiler and the Pope, and that I would refer the Decision of this unto the Compiler's Confessor; which any one else would have seen that I spoke it *Ironically*, and was far from leaving it to the Confessor to decide whether the Compiler did stand excommunicated for the pains he took in collecting and Printing the *Nubes Testium*. Every



### The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

Every body knows of their brags of *Discipline* and of their professed *Obedience* to the *Pope* in the *Church of Rome*: but *this behaviour* of the *Representer*, and of *Sabran the Jesuit*, whom I catcht in the *same Crime* and *Disobedience*, will satisfie most people how little *some Mens Writings* agree with *their Practices*, and what little credit is to be given to their so much celebrated *Discipline*, when *those* that make the *greatest noise* about it, are at the same time discovered to be the *most notorious Offenders* against it.

Having dispatcht all that *he* has offered in defence of himself about the *stealing his Book* out of a *forbidden Author*, I cannot but ask him before we part upon *this point*, whether it had not been better for *him* not to have meddled any more with *those things* which were so evident that *they* could not be denied, and so criminal that *they* could not be defended without the forfeiture of all *Sense of Modesty*, as well as betraying a want of *Learning*.

He is now come to the *Body of my Answer*, and complains of my *admirable Talent* of trifling in quarrelling him for beginning *his Book* with *The History of Donatus*, and shewing the *Nature of Schism*, and for my saying, *That this was so far from being a Chief Point, that it is no Point of Controversy at all betwixt us*. And upon this he falls to pitying me who had dwelt so long among Books for losing my time, and then shews that a *Chapter about Schism* was not improper to begin his Book with. But I would fain see this trifling proved; and will now prove that *he* is the guilty person who hath shuffled *three Chapters* together here, and hath not given us a *true or fair state* of the *Chapters*: I do own that a *Discourse about Schism* might be a *proper Introduction* to a *Controversial Book*, however I did shew that what *he* advanced there was *perfect trifling*.

I have

I have once already done it sufficiently, and must be forced in *Vindication* of *my self* to do it again to let the World see *who* is the *Caviller*, and at whose Door the *trifling* must be laid. His *first Chapter* was, that the *Fathers* accused the *Donatists* of being guilty of *Schism* for making the wicked Lives of the Members of the Church the reason of their Separation. My answer to this was, that this can be no point of Controversie betwixt us and the Church of Rome as he had made it, since we never urged the wicked Lives of some Members of the Church of Rome, as the ground of our Separation from them: and what says our Representer in Reply to this? Does he either prove, that this is a point of controversie betwixt us, or that our Separation from the particular Church of Rome is grounded upon the same matter that the *Donatists* was? No, we have no reason to expect a fair Reply from him, who did not set down the state of this Chapter at all.

The second Chapter was, that the *Fathers* teach against the *Donatists* that the *Catholick Church* cannot fail. This I told him could be no Controversie betwixt the Church of England and the Church of Rome, since we believe with the *Fathers* that the *Catholick Church* cannot fail. Was this then the *trifling* I am accused of? if it be, the Compiler had done well to have shewn it, that so upon the sight of my error I might have altered my mind: but this he thought fit not at all to attempt.

His third Chapter was, that the *Fathers* taught, that whosoever breaks the Unity of the *Catholick Church* upon any pretext whatsoever, is guilty of *Schism*. Upon this I told him, that taking the word pretext for a groundless pretence, I was of the same mind, and did believe the *Donatists* who acted so, to be guilty of a *Criminal Schism*: but assured the Compiler withal that this could not be matter of dispute betwixt us, who both assented to that doctrine of the *Fathers*; and here it is my *trifling* must be discovered,

and here he will have me not only to differ from *them*, but from the *Fathers*: this is hard when I had assented to *that Chapter* as set down by *him* and proved by the *Fathers*: but *he* will have it that I am for making the breach of the *Unity of the Catholick Church not Schism, unless it be done causelessly*; whereas the *Fathers* teach there can be no just cause: I grant the *Fathers* teach that there can be no just cause given by the *Catholick Church*; however that *particular Churches* can give and do often give just cause for others to break *Communion* with *them*, is what no *Father* will deny, is what the *Church of Rome* it self must grant; which hath not only broken *Communion* with *us*, but with the *whole Greek Church*, and yet I suppose does pretend to shew that *she* had a just cause for it. *He* hath offered hereupon nothing new in defence of his *three Chapters*, but some *hard words*, and those I do not intend to reply to, but will pass to the defence of his *Chapter* about the *Supremacy*.

I had charged *him* with giving a *false* and *imperfect* state of the *Controversie* betwixt *us* in relation to the *Pope's Supremacy*; but *this* he is not willing to defend, but turns it off with saying, *that it only is so, if my word be to be taken for it*: but I had not only given him *my word*, but *very good reasons* for it; and therefore since the *Compiler* hath no mind to be meddling with *reasons*, it would be uncivil to be importunate with calling upon *him* to disprove *them*. That *Chapter* as it did concern the greatest point of *Controversie* betwixt *us* and the *Church of Rome*, so it did require a great deal of canvassing, and admit of a vast variety of dispute in it: I was careful to follow the *Compiler* through it, and to debate and disprove every thing that was brought to support the *Pope's Supremacy* in it: but our *Compiler* is not so civil to me, nor so just to his *Book* in his *Vindication*, but forsakes the defence of every one of his passages, and only seems solicitous to make a shew; and that he may not be accused.

cused of saying *nothing at all* in defence of his Testimonies, and in Answer to a great many very severe charges in that Chapter, he serves us up again two or three bits of his former passages, and that is all.

I told him his first quotation from Irenæus was of no use; and gave him in short my reasons for it, all the answer he makes is to give us anew a piece of the same passage; and this with two or three scornful words, and crying good and great! must be called defending, and we must be content with such from him, since it seems the Man is not furnished with better, but if the old quotations presented anew will signify any thing, they are at your service, but upon this condition, that they may serve for a defence of themselves.

And such is his behaviour as to the next passage from Optatus, which I shewed to have been very obscure, and that in affirming there was but one Cathedra in the World possessed first by S. Peter, and after him by his Successors at Rome it did not only contradict the other parts of his Writings, but all Church Writers before and after him for hundreds of years, who make as many Cathedra's as Bishops in the World, and I instanced in a most plain place in Tertullian, which did assert the direct contrary to the Doctrine of that passage of Optatus. All the Answer besides rude language to these reasons that I can observe is, that it is a notorious fraud in me to pretend that the Father maintains here, That the Chair of Rome was such, that the rest of the Apostles might not have Cathedra's for themselves, whereas (says the Compiler) S. Optatus no where affirms this, but only, that the rest of the Apostles should not set up other Episcopal Chairs in opposition to this of Rome, or to contend with it.

I believe I have considered this passage a little better than this confident Gentleman, who perhaps never saw it any where but in Natalis Alexandre, or some Romish

*Writer* : and upon all the care I could take, I can see no reason for my being accused of fraud in this thing : or for altering my opinion of its denying *Cathedra's* to the rest of the *Apostles*. It first speaks of the *Episcopal Cathedra* being bestowed on *S. Peter* at *Rome*, it immediately calls it the **one Chair**, and requires such an *Unity* to be preserved by all in this **one Chair**, as to forbid even the *Apostles themselves* to erect *Cathedra's* for themselves, and makes it *Schism* to set up a *Chair* against this **SINGLE Cathedra** ; and to secure us from mistaking his meaning, it is just after this called the **ONLY** or **SOLE Cathedra**. If all this be not enough to satisfy that he speaks here of a *single* and **ONLY Cathedra** exclusively to any *other Chair*, I must confess I cannot see what words could do it, since had it been as much his design here, as I verily believe it was, to speak of there being but **one single Cathedra** in the World, he could not have used more full and larger expressions to declare his sense.

And now if this was his meaning in this passage, which it certainly was, notwithstanding the *Compilers* weak defence, what crime was it in me to shew that this was contrary to the rest of the *Fathers*, and what can be my fault to assent rather to what was the *general* and *certain doctrine* of the *generality* of *Fathers*, than to a *small passage* in *S. Optatus*, which does certainly contradict all them. This account of that passage will, I doubt not, acquit me of that hard thing I am accused of in the *Opinions* of all *unprejudiced Readers* : as for the *Compiler's* Opinion I do not value it, and therefore am far from being solicitous to gain it.

When I did in the next place declare my dissent to two affirmations quoted from *S. Hierom*, I did, as it was just, set down the *reasons* of that my dissent : my reasons the *Compiler* meddles not with, because it was too hard



hard for him to answer *them*, but thinks *he* has got advantage enough, and he makes triumphant use of it, that I durst be so hardy as not to assent to *any thing* said by *S. Hierom*, as if the words of *S. Hierom* were *sacred*, and one might as well deny assent to our *blessed Saviour's* words as to *his*; whereas had this *ignorant boaster* but been conversant even in *Bellarmino* and *Baronius*, he might have found *them* frequently enough setting aside the *Authority* and *Interpretation* of a *particular Father*, of *S. Hierom* for example, whose expressions about *Presbyters* and *Bishops* I do not believe this *Compiler himself* does subscribe to, any more than I did to *those* mentioned above: but he is too ignorant in these things, and therefore makes such *tragical* and *womanish outcries* about things, for which he would certainly be laughed at by *all men of learning*, even in his *own Church*.

Having made a little fluttering as to those *three passages*, he thinks he has done very great feats, and therefore needed not to trouble himself to examine the rest as they came in their order, but makes *one answer* to serve for *them all*, by telling the *Reader* I only shift them off, and that the most *eminent Protestants* did acknowledge that the *Popes* did exercise a like authority with that which is attributed to the *Pope* by the *Council of Florence*: and so I am shifted off, the reason of which is, because this *Compiler* is too ignorant for *such things*, and since it would be ridiculous here to serve us up again the *passages themselves* out of the *Nubes* in the *Vindication*, he hath nothing more for us: but thinks all is well if he can but bring in the *Concessions* of *Protestants*; but suppose *he* could bring *such Protestants* in, why must we be obliged to stand by what *they* granted or affirmed any more than *he* thinks himself obliged to be set down by what *some Schoolmen* have said, whom he does so frequently, may always throw by as *abusers* or *mistakers* of the *Church's genuine Doctrine*.

I used

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

I used to wonder whence it came to pass that every little *Romish Writer* could with so much readines quote the *Protestant Writers*, insomuch that the most trifling *Pamphleteer* would not fail to serve you up with a last course of the *Protestant Concessions*. Thus the *Antiquary* of Putney, and the *Maker of the Ecclesiastical Prospective-glass*, and the *Representer himself* not only here, but in his other *Pamphlets* are very punctual in quoting the *Protestant Authors*, whom they have no more read, than the *Alcoran* in *Arabick*. But as soon as I saw *Brerely's Protestant Apology*, I quickly discovered that this was the *Armoury* out of which these *doughty Writers* did furnish themselves, and that *this* is the *Book* out of which they all borrow, and very fairly take things upon his credit, the *truth* or *falsehood* of which they know nothing of: but why should not such men take their quotations as well as their Faith upon trust, and be as confident about the *truth* of the *first*, as they are of the *certainty* of the *other*? I will only tell our *Compiler* again, that I do no more pin my Faith upon the *groundless Concessions* of some *Protestant Writers*, than he does his upon the *Concessions* of some of his *Church-Writers*.

When he is come to his *Point* about *Tradition*, he is almost for thanking me for giving him but little trouble by granting there almost all that he contended for about *Traditions*, as I had granted as *kind things* in favour of the *Pope*. As to any *Concessions* about the *Pope* I shewed them to be false and groundless, in my *Answer* to the *Representer's Letter from a Dissenter*, by which *Answer* I question not but I have laid open sufficiently to the World the great Knavery of the *Representer* in that matter: but here he is for charging me again in his own Shape, what he had before acculed me of in his *Fanatical Disguise*. I have fully vindicated my self about my pretended *Concessions* as to *Tradition*, and throughly explained

plained in *what sense* I spoke of *Tradition* in my Book, and as fully exposed the great *Disingenuity* of the *Representer* there: I do refer the *Reader* for *these things* to my *Vindication of my self in Answer* to the *Dissenter's Letter*, because I would not do like the *Representer*, transcribe *one Book* into *another*.

In my *Answer* to the *Nubes*, I told the *Compiler* that his *Testimonies* about *Tradition* did refer to *matters* of *Discipline* and *Practice*, which *every Church* hath power to retain or alter as she sees most expedient, and that if he intended *them* for to prove that *Tradition* doth hand down to us *some Points* of *Faith*, which we are to receive, tho' they cannot be shewn to be founded upon the *Holy Scriptures*, I told him that *Sett of Testimonies* would not do his business, and was not to the purpose; and thereupon challenged him to produce *Fathers* for that *Point*, promising him at the same time a fair *Answer*: But our *Compiler* durst not offer to accept of the *Challenge*, dares not meddle with such a thing; but if *two or three bits* of the *Old Testimonies* out of the *Nubes* may be admitted, *they* are at my Service; and from *these* it is that he would fain prove *that even in matters of Belief, the Tradition of the Catholick Church is the best Demonstration*. What? better than the *Express Testimony* of *Scripture* it self? Methinks our ignorant *Compiler* might have been contented to have made *Tradition* only as good or equal to *Scripture* for the *Demonstration* of *Faith*, which is the highest the *Council of Trent* it self durst rise in favour of *Tradition*, and never pretended to mount *Tradition* so much above *Scripture* as to make it the BEST DEMONSTRATION of *Matters* of *FAITH*. But when *Ignorance* and too great a stock of *Confidence* meet together, such *Assertions* as these are commonly the fruits of them. But for this *extravagant Assertion* he hath a mind to bring in *Origen* for a  
Voucher,

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Voucher*, who speaking concerning the *Belief of Christ's* being the *Son of God*, says, *that is to be embrac'd which by a Succession from the Apostles is preserved in the Church by Ecclesiastical Tradition*: but in Answer to this, Is not that *Truth and Faith concerning Christ's being the Son of God* expressly taught and held forth in the *Holy Scriptures*; and which is more, doth not *Origen* himself expressly tell us in *this very place* (for our *Compiler* is for looking no further than his own *Book*) that *that Truth was to be learnt by us ab IPSO from Christ himself*, whose *Words, Doctrine and Actions* are used to be thought to have been the *Subject of the New Testament*, which I take to be *Scripture*: and as *this Doctrine* was to be read in the *Scriptures*, so it was delivered down from thence in *Ecclesiastical Tradition*, which can mean nothing else than either that the *Scriptures* which did comprehend *that Faith*, were delivered down successively from Age to Age in the *Church*, or that *this was always taught in the Sermons and Homilies of the Fathers of the Church* successively.

And to give our *Compiler* a better knowledge of *Origen's* sence about *these things*, I will refer him to one *Passage* which I will set down and desire him to consider of it: *Origen* in his *Homilies upon Leviticus* speaking of the *Old and New Testament* tells us, that in *THEM* every word that appertaineth to *God* [by which Expression the least he can mean is, that every *Point of Faith*] may be sought after and found out, and all *Knowledge of things* may be apprehended from *THEM*. But if any thing doth remain which the *Holy Scripture* doth not determine, no other third *Scripture* ought to be received for the *Authorizing* any *Knowledge*, but we are to commit to the *Fire* that which remaineth, that is, we must leave it to *God*, for in this present *World* *God* is not for having us to know all things.

Our

*Origen in  
Leviticum,  
c. 7. Homi-  
lia 5. p. 144.  
Edit. Fro-  
ben. 1536.*

Our Compiler is next for having *Tertullian* on his side, but why does he not then bring us something to prove it, or rather why did he not disprove what I had produced for the *Authority* and *Sufficiency* of the *Holy Scriptures* from *Tertullian*? He neither does the one, nor offers at the other, and yet *this* must pass it seems for *vindicating*.

And just thus he serves me after; for when I in *Vindication* of *S. Basil* had quoted him declaring for the necessity of *Scripture-Evidence* for *Matters of Faith*, he says not one Syllable in Answer to it, but is for referring me to the old *Quotations* out of *Basil*, *Epiphanius* and *Lirinenfis*, which I had shewn him before were not to the purpose; which is such perfect trifling as none but such a *Compiler* as he is would be guilty of.

He then falls to *thanking me* for saying in relation to the *Testimony* from *Gregory Nyssen*, that we allow the *Tradition* of *Antiquity* to be highly useful and necessary in the *Interpreting* or giving us the genuine *Sense* of *Points of Faith*: all the Answer I will give him is, much good may it do him, however how far that *Expression* was from doing us any hurt, or them any good, I have abundantly shewn in my *Vindication*, which I am loth to transcribe hither: but that I may not be behind-hand in Civility for the *Compiler's Thanks*, I will present him in Token of my Gratitude with a *Passage* or two from his *Gregory Nyssen* and other *Fathers*, which I must recommend to his Consideration.

*Gregory Nyssen* in his *Dialogue de Animâ & Resurrextione* lays it down for a Position, which no Man ought to contradict, that in that only the Truth <sup>(b)</sup> must be acknowledged, which hath upon it the Seal of *Scripture-Testimony*. <sup>(b)</sup> Καὶ τῆς ἀν' αὐτοῖς, μὴ ἔχει ἐν τούτῳ μόνον ἢ ἀλήθειαν πείδω, ὃ σφραγὶς ἐπεί τ' γε αὐτῆς μαρτυρεῖται. *Greg. Nyssen Dial. de Animâ & Resurrect. Tom. 2. P. 639. Edit. Paris. 1615.*

F

And



Idem in O-  
rat. de iis  
qui adeunt  
Hierosol.

Tom. 2. p.  
1084.

(c) In iis  
quæ aperte in

Scripturâ posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moresq; vi-  
vendi. August. de Doctr. Christianâ, l. 2. c. 9. Tom. 3. p. 17, 18.

(d) D. Hi-  
eron. in Ag-  
genm, c. 1.  
Tom. 6. p.  
230. Edit.  
Basil. 1565.

S. Hierom speaking of the Hereticks in his time, which made so much noise, and pretended so highly to Apostoli-  
cal Tradition, gives this severe Doom upon them, but those  
things also, which they of themselves invent and [yet]  
feign to have received as it were by Tradition from the Apo-  
stles without the Authority and Testimonies of the Scriptures,  
the sword of God doth smite. (d)

I could give him several such Testimonies from other  
Fathers, but I will neither trouble him or the Reader  
with any more at present, it will be time enough to send  
him the rest when he hath answered these. And will  
now pass to his next Chapter and the Vindication of it.

But here it seems there was no need of any Vindica-  
tion, for I am brought in as one of their own side, for  
saying and granting that our Church doth honour the Saints  
in observing days in honour or memory of them: and I have  
the Compiler's thanks for it here: we have had this Con-  
cession up once already, it made one of the most terrible  
Articles of Popery against me in our Compiler's masque-  
rading Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church  
of England: In my Answer to that scurrilous Letter I did  
sufficiently acquit my self and our Church in relation to  
her Practice about Festival Days.

However our Compiler, now he has laid aside his Dis-  
guise, advances the same Accusation against me in his  
own

own Person, but considering *what Church he was of*, could do no less than give me *Thanks* for my *Concessions*: Well then, since *this Man* is not ashamed of serving us up again the *very same Objections* which I had already answered, I must e'en be forced to trouble the Reader with *Repetition*, since the importunity of an *Adversary* that cannot blush, forces me upon it, and must tell the *Compiler* a second time, that when *our Church* doth set apart *Days* for the *commemorating* of the *Saints*, which is all the *Honour* *she* either gives or intends *Them*, *she* only appoints them for to bless *God* for the good and pious Examples of his *Saints* and *Martyrs*, not to put up *Prayers* to the *Saints themselves*, nor to offer *Praises* unto *Them*, but to *their God*, which was the *genuine Practice* of the *Primitive Church*, as I shewed from the *Example* of the *Church of Smyrna*, in relation to *S. Polycarp* their *Martyred Bishop*. *Our Church* pays no *Religious Worship* to the *Saints themselves*, but the *Church of Rome* does not only *worship them*, but is very lavish and extravagant in it, as it were easie to shew: however as *they* of the *Church of Rome* are not imitated by *us*, so neither have *they* the *Example* of the *Primitive Church* to defend their *present Practices*.

We do with the *Primitive Church* honour the *Martyrs* and *Saints*, and have often enough declared it to be *such an Honour* as was given to *them* in the *Primitive Times*, and what that *Honour* was, *S. Austin* shall determine, who in answer to a *false Aspersions* of the *Manichees*, of the *Church's* worshipping the *Saints upon their Festival Days* and at their *Monuments*, told *Faustus* the *Manichee*, that the *Church* did indeed *worship* the *Martyrs*, but that it was with *no other Worship* than that of *Love* and *Fel-* <sup>(<sup>c</sup>) Colimus</sup>  
*lowship* which is paid to the (<sup>c</sup>) *Holy Men of God* while <sup>ergo Marty-</sup>  
*dilectionis & societatis, quo & in hac vita coluntur sancti homines Dei.* <sup>res eo cultu</sup> *D.*  
*Aug. cont. Faust. Manich. l. 20. c. 21. in Tomo 6. Oper. August.*

### The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

*they are alive on Earth.* That *this* was no other than a *civil worship* or *respect* I hope will not be denied by my *Adversary*, since I suppose *he* will not pretend to shew, that *mortal* and *frail men*, while on Earth, are used to have *Religious Worship* paid unto *them*, and *solemn Prayers* offered up to *them* with all the *external indications* of devotion.

As to the *Concessions* which he pretends I have made, and supposes *it* here again, because I did not particularly consider the *Testimonies* under *that Head*; I must tell him a second time that I neither did grant all that *he* had collected in the *Nubes Testium* upon *that Subject*, nor seemed to grant it, but did set them aside as *needless*: and am, notwithstanding *our Compiler*, far from joining with *them* in *this Point*, as *he* falsely would insinuate that I do: but this is not the *first* of *such wrongs* done to *me* by *this Compiler*.

When *he* is next come to the *Chapter* about *Invocation of Saints*, *he* tells the *Reader* that *I* appear with some *disconfidence* of *my cause*: and therefore (says the *Compiler* p. 19.) *tho' he pretended in the Title Page, that Antiquity for the first five hundred years did not favour this, or any Doctrine of the Church of Rome: here he has considered better on't, and therefore cutting off Two of the Five, he says, we cannot shew this to have been the Practice of the first Three Centuries.* So that here *he* is willing to give us the *Fourth and Fifth Ages*, as *Practising the Invocation of Saints*. The *Compiler* quotes for all this the 43. page of *my Answer* to the *Nubes Testium*; and a little after tells the *Reader*, that I grant that *Invocation of Saints* was practised in the *Fourth and Fifth Centuries*.

If ever I was surprized at the reading any thing in my life, it was at this account of *my Book* against *that Chapter* in the *Nubes*; my *memory* of what I had written and

and this account of it were so diametrically opposite, that I could not but immediately look into my Book to see whether was in the fault, and quickly found that this Compiler had need to have a very large forehead that would venture at this, when my Book was in so many hands.

For first as to his saying, I have cut off two of the five Centuries, and only insist on their being not able to shew, that Invocation of Saints was practis'd in the First Three Centuries, it is very false: I neither cut off two of the five, nor insisted upon the three first Centuries only, but said in that very page and place quoted by the Compiler, that I would pass on to Invocation of Saints, and see whether the Compiler did shew this to have been the practice of the Three first Centuries, and so on: does and so on here signify nothing? I did intend it, and I question not but the World understood it to mean the two next Centuries, to wit, the Fourth and Fifth in Controversie betwixt us: and yet this Writer hath the assurance to tell the World I had cut them two off.

He next tells them, that I am willing to give the Papists the Fourth and Fifth Ages as practising Invocation of Saints; and a little lower, that I have granted that Invocation of Saints was practis'd in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. This is just as true as the other, for to expose this bold falsehood, I need turn over only to the next page in my Book, and transcribe what I had said there, which I intreat the Reader to compare with what the Compiler says of it here.

Speaking in defence of the Church of England's not practising Invocation of Saints, I have these very expressions; We have far more reason to reject Invocation and solemn Prayers to Saints as Superstitious, since it is against Scripture, and against the Practice of the Three first Centuries, AGAINST A COUNCIL in the FOURTH CENTURY,

### The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

RY, and WANTS A PATTERN EVEN IN THE FIFTH and SIXTH, and hath NO EXAMPLE in ANY of the PLACES produced by our Compiler on this head.

With what face then could *this man* write that *I had given up the fourth and fifth Centuries*? Who can believe that *such men* have in reality either Religion or Conscience, that can with so much deliberation commit such a deliberate wrong? Had he had any regard to Truth or Honesty, his Conscience must have shewn into his Face, and told him, that what he was then writing was a very great injustice, and directly false. Good God! that men who make such shew of Religion, make such frequent appeals unto the God of purer Eyes, than either to behold iniquity, or to let it go unpunished; that talk so often of a day of Judgment, and severe reckoning, can do such things as must force the World to believe, that they are not in earnest in these things! I must say, that the Representers with some other Writers which I could name are very unhappy men, since they either are embarkt in defence of a Cause which cannot be upheld by better Arguments and Methods, or they do very great hurt to their cause in defending a good cause with such unlawful Weapons.

But to return, the only excuse that can be made for him is, that he was necessitated to it; for as to the three first Centuries he found there was no manner of defence to be made for their Invocation of Saints thence, and that if I did not grant him that the fourth or fifth Century practised Invocation of Saints, he should have nothing to say for his Church, or his Book, as to those five hundred years which in the Title of his *Nubes Testium* he had appealed, and pretended to. He was forc'd therefore, since I neither did grant him, nor could do it, to set the best Face he could upon the matter; and to say, *I had granted that Invocation of Saints was the Practice of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.*

And



And upon *this* all is built that he hath to say in defence of his *Nubes* in the *Vindication*, and he sets very heartily to it with the assistance of his Friend Monsieur de Meaux, and wonders how we can think those illustrious Fathers should practise it, had not the same been a doctrine of the foregoing Ages: and runs on in commending the *Virtue and Learning* of those Fathers: forgetting all this while that he was guilty of begging the question, and which is worse, of taking that as granted, which had been expressly denied him, that those Fathers did practise *Invocation of Saints*: He should first have proved the thing, and then he might have harangued upon it, but he begun at the wrong end, and since he was not at leisure to disprove fairly and fully any of the *Answers* I had given to his *Nubes*, but only by saying, that my distinguishing betwixt *Requests made to Saints*, and *Prayers solemnly addressed to them* was a shift, and a piece of *Controversial Legerdemain*, and serving us up with the old provision out of the *Nubes* to confirm what he said; I should not trouble my self any further with *this Matter*: but that I am called upon by his Friend F. Sabran the Jesuit, and challenged to shew a difference betwixt what was practised by S. Austin, and ALL the Fathers of his and the precedent Century, and what is now practised by the Church of Rome in relation to *Invocation of Saints*.

This I promised to do, as soon as the *Controversie* betwixt him and me about the 35<sup>th</sup> Sermon of S. Austin de Sanctis was either ended or dropt: and since it is dropt, and that matter by my second Letter to the Jesuit was (to use one of his own expressions) made out against him beyond the possibility of a seeming Answer; I will now be just to my word: and that I may more fully vindicate our Church from that Schism the Jesuit lays to her charge upon this account, I will beg leave of the Reader to enlarge a little more upon this point in order to the further clearing of matters about it.

What

### The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

What is meant by *Invocation* it self is no matter of Controversie betwixt us, their Council of Trent, and their Catechism afterwards have sufficiently taught this, and make it to be an offering up of Prayer to the glorified Saints, and a calling upon them for their Prayers, Help and Assistance. I will not insist upon the invincible arguments from the Word of God against such Invocation of Saints, nor stay to shew how both Old and New Testament command and direct all our Prayers and Addresses to God, and how that there is not one Example of Invocation of Saints in the whole word of God : but will pass to the Testimonies and Writings of the Fathers, which they of the Church of Rome insist so much upon. The Jesuit my Adversary hath offered nothing new, but hath assaulted me with those passages out of the Nubes Testium which I had answered before, and challenges me to shew what the Church of Rome doth more, or different from what was practised then by S. Austin, and ALL the Fathers of his Age, and the precedent Century.

I will take leave in order to shewing these things, to prove these four Particulars, First, That Invocation of Saints is the Practice of the Church of Rome.

Secondly, That it is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is good and profitable to invoke Saints.

Thirdly, That Invocation of Saints was not the Practice of the Primitive Fathers.

Fourthly, That the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers was directly against, and inconsistent with any Invocation of Saints.

The two first of these, to wit, that the Invocation of Saints is not only the Doctrine but the Practice of the Church of Rome, I hope the Jesuit will give me leave to suppose, since those things need no proving which are the daily Practices of their Church, and the avowed Doctrine of every true Son of their Church. I could else fill up

two or three sheets with Collections out of their Missals and Offices of the *Virgin Mary* to prove this thing plainly upon them: but there is no need of it, and therefore I will begin the proof of my *Third Particular*.

That *Invocation of Saints* was not the Practice of the Primitive Fathers. I will deduce this methodically through the several first Ages, and shew not only what was the Practice of the Church in her Liturgy, but also the Practice of the most eminent Fathers thereof.

Towards the later end of the first Century lived S. Ignatius. I. Century. natius, an account of his Practice we meet with in that Relation of his Martyrdom, which was drawn up by Philo, Gaius, and Agathopus, who attended him from Antioch, and were present at his Martyrdom at Rome. In that account we can meet with no recommendation of himself in his greatest distress, or of his Church, to any tutelar Saint or Angel, or to the *Virgin Mary*; but upon his being condemned to be torn apieces by the wild Beasts from the Emperour Trajan's own mouth we find him breaking out into joy, and giving praises to the Lord for honouring him with those Chains the Souldiers were putting upon him, and praying to Him for his Church of Antioch, and recommending it with tears unto his Saviour. When he was come to Rome, and was met by the Christian Brethren there, they went to Prayers together, and made up a Christian Assembly, with bended Knees praying earnestly to their blessed Saviour the Son of God for the several particular Churches, for a stop to the Persecution, and for the mutual Charity of the Christian Brethren.

Acta & Martyrium S. Ignatii. Edit. Usser. 1647.

And as the Writers of this Martyrdom represent the glorious Martyr always making his Addresses to God the Son: So after his Martyrdom, they give the same account of their own Devotions, that they were offered up with tears and bended knees unto the same Lord.

In the second Century we have the famous Epistle of the Church

G

Church

Ibidem.

## The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

Church of Smyrna concerning the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp, wherein we meet with an account of his Practice in his Devotions. They inform us of his continuing instant in Prayer to God day and night for the peace and Tranquillity of all the Christian Churches, and have preserved us the very Prayer he used when he was tyed to the stake to suffer Martyrdom, which we find addressed wholly to God the Father \* through the everlasting High-Priest Jesus Christ his only Son: not one syllable, nor the least hint of any Romish Invocation of Saint or Angel, either to assist, or defend, or recommend him unto God.

\* Apud Euseb.  
Hist. Eccles. l.  
4. c. 15.

After this account of the Religious Practice of those two most glorious Martyrs the Christian Church ever had next to the Apostles, I will set down in the same Century Justin Martyr's account of the Christian Liturgie; where we may justly expect to meet with a full relation to whom all the Services of the Church were addressed at that time. His account is, that their Publick and Common Prayers, their Praises, and Thanksgivings for the good things of this life were offered up by their Bishop to God the Father through his Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost. Here is no mention in this very exact account of the Christian Service of any Prayers, or so much as Wishes made to Angels or Saints; no footsteps of any Practice of invoking of Saints, which is evidence strong enough that such things were not then in being any where.

† Justin M. in  
Apol. 2. Edit.  
Paris. P. 97.  
98.

III. Century.  
Tertull. Apo-  
log. c. 39.  
Edit. Franco-  
3597.

In the beginning of the Third Century, Tertullian in his Apologetic, acquaints us at large with the Practice of the Catholick Church, and the nature of her Liturgy, and sets her out as offering up her Prayers with the united Forces and joint requests of the whole Congregation unto God, as praying to him for all Estates and Conditions; and in his account of their Love-Feasts in the same place he acquaints us, that they did not sit down to those Feasts, till they had made their Prayers unto God, that as they begun them with Prayers



*Prayers unto God, so they ended them with singing Hymns unto God. Not a syllable is to be met with in Tertullian's Narration of the Customs and Divine Service of the Church of God of the Third Century, about any Prayers to, or Invocation of Saints, of any Praises to God and the Virgin Mary, or to God and any other of the Angels or Saints.*

In the Fourth Century we meet with a much larger and more particular account of the Divine Service in the Christian Assemblies from the Book called *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, which bears the name of *Clementis Romanus*, but really belongs to some Author of the Fourth Age. In this there is not only an account of their Practice, but a very great many of the Prayers then used are put down at large, every one of which we find directed to God alone, not the least mention or hint of any Invocation of Saints, of any Prayers to the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint; and as all the Prayers of the Church then in that Century, according to this Author, as well on all other days as the Lord's day, as well in all other Offices and services of the Church as in the Communion-Service it self were offered up only to God, so there is no desire or Petition in them for any of the Saints aid, assistance or Intercession. All which Circumstances together shew how far Invocation of Saints was from being the Practice of the Catholic Church in the Fourth Century, when in the Prayers addressed to God alone, there was not so much as any mention of the Saints Intercession or Aid, which are things so frequent now in the Church of Rome, that they desire of God for the Merits of the Saints both spiritual and temporal Blessings.

As we find the Practice of the Fourth Century so visibly, without any Prayers to, or Invocation of Saints, so we are as certain that such Invocation or Prayers got no footstep in the Publick Offices of the Church, either during the rest of this Century, or in the Fifth Century; of this

See *Clementis Romani Constitutiones Apostolicae*, from the 25<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the 7<sup>th</sup> Book to the end of the Eighth Book in Labbe's Councils. Tom. 1. p. 428, &c.



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

†August. de  
Civ. Dei. l. 22.  
c. 10.

we cannot desire a more certain and satisfactory account than we have from S. *Austin* himself, about whom the *Jesuit Sabran* hath made so much stir, and doth still insist upon it, that S. *Austin* did invoke the *Virgin Mary*. S. *Austin* in his *Books de Civitate Dei*, giving an account of the *Service of the Church in his Age*, and of what was the *Practice of the Church* in relation to the *Martyrs*, tells us indeed, that *the Martyrs names were recited during the divine Service*, but tells also as expressly, that *they were not then invoked by the Priest who did officiate* †.

I have traced hitherto the *Practice of the Primitive Church* through the *Five First Centuries*; I have insisted chiefly upon *those Authors and Books* which present us with the *Liturgies*, which are doubtless the *best and only Evidences* of the *Practice of the Primitive Church* for *those Ages*. I have not insisted upon the *Practice of particular Persons*, excepting those two glorious and most conspicuous *Martyrs*, S. *Ignatius* and S. *Polycarp*, whose *Prayers* I question not were wholly conformed to the *Publick Services* in the *Churches in their time*: Had I done the *same* concerning the *other Martyrs* of the *first and later Ages* that I did about *them two*, or had I been careful to urge the *Practice of particular Persons* apparent in their *own writings*, I must have transcribed a great part of the *ancient Martyrologies*, where we find all the *Prayers of those Martyrs* addressed to *God*; and must have filled too many *Pages* with the *Instances* of other *particular Persons and Writers*.

But I thought the other method of urging only the *Liturgies* of the *several first Centuries*, as the fairest way of understanding the *Practice of the Primitive Church in those Ages*, and I believe I have made it fully and undeniably evident, that *Invocation of Saints was not the Practice of the Primitive Fathers*.

As we are able to shew from the *ancient Accounts* of the

the Churches Services, that Invocation of Saints was not their Practice, so we are as able to shew, that the Doctrine of the Fathers of those first five Centuries was directly against, and inconsistent with any such Invocation of Saints as is now practised in the Church of Rome: and this I shall the more largely insist upon, because this is an Argument which they of that Church cannot evade, and this doth so firmly strengthen and back the other Argument against Invocation of Saints drawn from the Practice of the Primitive Church.

And this one would think would stop their mouths, and make them lay aside their Pretensions to Instances of Invocation of Saints practised in the fourth and fifth Centuries, to shew them not only that Invocation of Saints was not practised then, but that the Doctrine of the first Ages and Fathers were directly against, and utterly inconsistent with any such Invocation of Saints as is practised in the Church of Rome. And this is that which I will endeavour to shew from the Writings of the several Fathers, putting them down methodically in their several Ages, to wit,

That the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers was directly against, and inconsistent with any Invocation of Saints.

S. Ignatius who lived immediately after the Apostles, I. Century. in his Epistle to the Philadelphians gives the Virgins of that Church his advice to direct all their Prayers to the blessed Trinity: O ye Virgins (says he) have Christ alone before your Eyes, and his Father in your Prayers, being illuminated by the Holy Spirit. If they are to direct all their Prayers to the Father and Son, I am sure it is against this Doctrine of S. Ignatius to practise Invocation of Saints, and direct some of their Prayers to the Virgin Mary and other Saints, which the Church of Rome now does expressly against this First Father's Advice.

<sup>h</sup> Ignat. in Ep. ad Philadelph.

Ἄι παρθέναι, ἔχετε τὸν Χριστὸν ὡφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν, φωτισθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

αὐτὸν πατέρα ἐν ταῖς ἐννοαῖς, φωτισθόμεναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁγίου.

The

II. Century. The Church of Smyrna in their *Golden Epistle* concerning the *Martyrdom* of S. Polycarp, giving an Account of the Devil, and the Jews slandering them as if they would have left Christ, and worshipped Polycarp, if they could but gain his *Martyred Body*, expose that gross *Calumny*, by shewing <sup>i</sup> that Christians could never leave Christ who had suffered all for them, nor pay any *Worship* to any other Person, (or as the Old Latin Translation hath it, nor offer up the *Supplication* of Prayer to any other Person). If they could not do it then, I suppose it is not *grown* more lawful to do it since.

ἡ Ἀγροῦντες ἐπὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν Χριστὸν πῶς καὶ καταλίσσιν it, nor offer up the *Supplication* of Prayer to any other Person). If they could not do it then, I suppose it is not *grown* more lawful to do it since.

τὸ πάντως ἡσίου τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ παθόντα, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔβωδον. Eccl. Smyrn. in Ep. de Martyr. Polyc. p. 27. Edit. Usser.

S. Irenaeus in the same Century discoursing about the many Graces bestowed by God upon his Church, and the great benefits done by the Church to the whole World without either design of seducing, or desire of gain thereupon, says, that as the Church doth receive those Graces freely from God's hands, so she freely ministers them, <sup>k</sup> and then tells us also that the Church doth nothing by *Invocation* of Angels, or Charms, or any such *curious Art*, but directing her Prayers purely and manifestly to her Lord, who made all things, and *Invoking* the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ doth those Miracles for the good of Mankind, not for their seduction.

<sup>k</sup> Nec Invocationibus Angelicis faciat aliquid, nec incantationibus, nec aliqua prava curiositate, sed mundè, & purè, & manifestè Orationes dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, & Nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi invocans virtutes secundum utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perficit. S. Iren. adv. Hæc. l. 2. c. 57. Edit. Feuardent.

As Irenaeus is plain for the Prayers being directed only to God and his Christ, and does in express Terms deny that there was any *Invocation* of Angels practised in the Church then; so Clemens of Alexandria in the same Century, and not long after him, is so express against any Prayers being then put up to either Saints or Angels, that

that he defines Prayer it self to be, *ᾠδὴ πρὸς τὸ Θεόν*, a *conversing with God*, which had been a very false definition, had Prayers then been put up to Saints and Angels also. But Clemens had reason sufficient to define Prayer in this manner to the Exclusion both of Saints and Angels, since in the same Book he delivers it for the Doctrine of his time, that <sup>1</sup> *since there is but*

**ONE GOOD GOD**, both we and Angels ought to make our Prayers to HIM ALONE for the obtaining of those good things which we want, and for the continuance of those which we enjoy.

<sup>1</sup> *Ἐνός τως ἐνός ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνου τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ μὴ δοθῆναι, καὶ παραμένειν ἐν χρόνῳ, ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι.* Clemens Alexandr. *Strom.* l. 7.

There are a great many more such Expressions to be met with in this Learned Father, but this doubtless is able to convince any reasonable Person that in Clemens's time the Doctrine of the Church was, that all Prayer or Invocation should be offered up to the **GREAT GOD ALONE**.

That there was no alteration made in the next Century III. Century. in the Doctrine of the Fathers herein, we can easily shew from the most considerable Writers of that Age.

Tertullian in his *Apology* for the Christians to the Roman Judges, gives an account of the Practice of the Christians, that they did invoke the Eternal God for the safety of the Emperours; and acquaints them withal, that They durst not offer up their Prayers to any other.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot (says he) pray for these things to any other, but to HIM at whose hands I am certain of obtaining them, since it is HE ALONE that does afford them, and I alone have a Right of obtaining them, that am his Servant, and observe HIM ALONE, who am killed for his Religion, and do offer unto

me Nos enim pro salute Imperatorum Deum INVOCAMUS Aeternum, — Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quàm à quo me scio consecuturum, quoniam & ipse est qui SOLUS præstat, & ego sum cui impetrare debetur, famulus ejus qui eum solum observo, qui propter disciplinam ejus occidor, qui ei offero optimam & majorem hostiam, quam ipse mandavit, Orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam. Tertul. *Apolog.* c. 39.

Him

*Him that rich and best Sacrifice which He himself hath commanded, Prayer proceeding from a chaste Body, from an innocent Soul, and Holy Spirit.*

Idem de Præscript. c. 33.

In his *Prescriptions* the same Father tells us, that the *serv'ing* or *Worshipping* of *Angels*, brought in first by *Simon Magus*, was reckoned to be *Idolatry*.

In considering these passages of *Tertullian*, I cannot believe that *He*, and the *Church of Rome* are of the same *Faith* as to this very thing about *Prayer*. I am sure this *Doctrine* of his is no less than *Herefy* in some parts of the *World*, and that *Tertullian*, and the *Honest Monk* who translated *S. Thomas of Canterbury*, or to speak more intelligibly *Thomas à Becket's Life* into *English Metre*, were not of the same *Church*. *Tertullian* told the *Romans*, that the *Christians* of his time offered up *their Prayers* to *GOD ALONE* for the *Welfare of the Emperours and Empire*, and that it was contrary to *God's Will* for them to offer up *any Prayers* to *any other*: but this *Romish Monk* was of another *Church* sure, when he gives us a very different *practice*. It will be very acceptable to give the *Reader* the *Monk's Prayer*, not only for the extraordinary nature of it, but for the *Saint's sake so famous in England*. Having finished his *Translation* of the *Saints Life*, He concludes all with this *Prayer* to the *Saint himself*.

To whom with all devotion now lett us hartely pray  
and with this subsequent Prayer thus shall I end and cease  
O Laureat Precious Martyr preferbe the Church alway  
our kynge with the Commynalte, and send us rest and pease  
The Hed Father of this Monastery with all his both more and lesse  
Preferbe of special grace, and pray for the quicke and dede  
which for the Church cause list gladly thy blood shedde.

Vita cum Actibus Thome Cant. Archiep. in  
English Metre, Translated 1497. in a  
MS. in Bennet College Library.

I will



I will pass on to the next *Father*, *Origen*, who will give us the fullest account of the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, especially in that *Treatise* which he wrote in defence of *Christianity* it self against *Celsus*, the eighth Book of which *Treatise* is almost wholly spent in the proving, that all *Worship* and *Prayer* are to be offered up to GOD ALONE through our LORD JESUS CHRIST. *Celsus* the *Heathen* was of opinion, that inasmuch as the *Angels* did belong to God, men ought to make *Oblations* and *Prayers* to them, that thereby they might obtain their favour, and *Intercession*, and make them propitious unto them. *Origen* rejects this *Advice* with indignation. *Away* (says he) with *Celsus's* Counsel, that tells us we must PRAY TO ANGELS, and let us not afford the least ear to it: for [as for us *Christians*] we must PRAY TO HIM ALONE, who is GOD over all: and we must PRAY to the WORD of GOD his only Begotten, and the First-born of all *Creatures*; and we must intreat HIM, that He as High Priest would present our *Prayer* (when come up to him) unto his God, and our God. And for the procuring the favour of the *Angels*, he just after tells *Celsus*, that the way to attain it was to lead holy Lives, and to imitate the *Angels* in their uninterrupted service of God: assuring him withal that if by that means we have God favourable to us, we have all his Friends, both *Angels*, *Souls* and *Spirits*, loving and affectionate to us.

And before this in his Fifth Book against the same *Heathen*, upon *Celsus's* inquiry what the *Christians* lookt upon *Angels* to be, and his answer, that though they were wont from their office to call them *Angels*, yet that they

ἡ Ἀπαρχὴ ὅτι καὶ Κέλσος συμ-  
βελῶν, λέγων, ὅτι, Περσδουκτίον  
εἶναι δαίμονα, καὶ ἔδδ' ὅτι τὸ πρῶ-  
τον ἀκούσθαι αὐτοῦ. ΜΟΝΩ  
καὶ περσδουκτίον τῷ ὅτι πᾶσι  
ΘΕΩ, καὶ περσδουκτίον ἡ τῷ  
ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΕΙ καὶ Πρω-  
τόκω πᾶσις κτίσις, ΛΟΓΩ  
ΘΕΟΥ, καὶ Ἀξιωτέρων αὐτὸν,  
ὡς Ἀρχιερεῖα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθά-  
σαι ἡμῶν ἐυχλῶ ἀναφέρειν  
ὅτι καὶ Θεὸν αὐτὸν, καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν.  
Origen. contra Celsum, l. 8.  
p. 395. Edit. Cantabr. 1658.

found them named Gods in the Scriptures by reason of a certain Divinity in them; Origen does prevent the Heathen's Assumption, that if they were such, they ought to be worshipped, by telling him that the Scriptures did not give Angels the Names of Gods, so as to command us to worship and adore them instead of God who are ministring

° Spirits, & bring down to us the Blessings

° Τὸς δὲ Ἀγγέλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτῶν μεταθηκόμενοι καλεῖν, εὐερίσκειν αὐτοὺς, διὰ τὸ θεῖος εἶναι, καὶ θεὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερατεῖς πρὸς ὀνομαζομένους γενομένους, ἀλλ' ἔχει, ὥστε περιστάσεως ἡμῶν τὰς ἀναγκαιότητας, καὶ φέρουσιν ἡμῶν πρὸς τὸ Θεῷ, σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ΠΑΣΑΝ μὲν γὰρ ΔΕΗΣΙΝ καὶ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΝ, καὶ ΕΝΤΕΤΕΞΙΝ καὶ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΝ ἀναπημύσαν τῷ Θεῷ Πᾶσι Θεῷ, ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ἀπὸ πάντων Ἀγγέλων Ἀρχιερέως, ΕΜΨΥΧΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ καὶ Θεοῦ. ΔΕΗΣΟΜΕΘΑ καὶ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ, καὶ ἐνδοξάμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν καὶ προσδοξάμεθα. ὅ--- Ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλεῖται μὴ ἀναλαβοῦντες καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστήμιον ἐκ εὐλογον, &c. Origen. contra Celsum, l. 5. p. 233. Edit. Cambr.

I cannot leave this so particular an account of the Church's Doctrine against Invocation, without making an Observation from it, which is, that Origen does make  
Invocation.

*Invocation* and *Worship* to be *Synonymous* here, and does confine *them* both to the *same Object*, and shews, that whatsoever is *invocated* is *worshipped*, and that since all *Worship* is peculiar to *God alone*, all *Prayer* upon that account must be offered up to *Him alone*: and if this was the *Church's sense* at that time, as we are hence certain it was, we can very justly gather from it, that *they* were far from either *practising* or *teaching* an *Invocation* of *Saints* or *Angels*, who were for dedicating all *Prayer* to *God alone*: and we may also gather this further from it, that where any *other Fathers* do deny any *worship's* being paid to any *Creature*, they did by that very denial exclude all *Invocation*, or *Prayer* being made to any, even the *most glorified Creature*, since *Invocation* or *Prayer* is one of the *chief parts* of *Worship*. *Origen* himself, and *other Fathers* after him (as I shall shew at large) do make *Invocation* and *Adoration* to be the *same thing*, and do prove the *Divinity* of our *Blessed Saviour* from his being *Invocated* or *prayed* to, which would have been a false and an absurd Argument, had *Saints* and *Angels* been *invocated* at that time, and it would have proved too much, since if our *Saviour* is proved to be *God* from his being *Invocated*, all the *Saints* as well as *Angels* were by the *same Argument* proved to be *Gods*, had they been *Invocated* in those days. I will give the *Reader* his words, since they are of such extraordinary moment herein.

*Origen* commenting upon that passage in *St. Paul*, *How shall they call on* [or *invoke*] *him in whom they have not believed*, tells us, that the *Jews* did not *invoke* *Christ*, because they did not believe in *Him*; and argues afterwards, that if *Enos*, *Moses*, *Aaron* and *Samuel* did call on, or *invoke* the *Lord*, they did without doubt *invoke* *Christ* *Jesus* the *Lord*: for if (says he in proof there-

¶ — Et si INVOCARE Domini nomen, & ADORARE DEUM, UNUM atq; IDEM est, sicut INVOCATUR CHRISTUS & ADORANDUS est Christus, & sicut offerimus Deo Patri primo omnium Orationes, ita & Domino Jesu Christo, &c. Orig. In Ep. ad Rom. l. 8. c. 10. p. 477, 478. Edit. Frob. 1536.

of) to call upon the name <sup>p</sup> of the Lord, and to ADORE GOD, be ONE and the SAME THING; as CHRIST is INVOCATED, so CHRIST is also to be ADORED; and as we offer to God the Father first of all Prayers, so we do also to the Lord Jesus Christ; and as we offer up supplications to the Father, so do we offer Supplications also to the Son; and as we do offer Thanksgivings to God, so we do offer Thanksgivings to our Saviour; for we must pay ONE and the SAME HONOUR to THEM BOTH, to wit, to GOD the FATHER and SON.

I must obviate also before I leave Origen an objection commonly made, that in these passages there is no mention nor denial of Prayers to Saints, nor no forbidding of them, to which we can easily answer, that there is indeed no mention of Prayers to Saints, but only of Prayers to Angels: but we argue à fortiori from these places, that if Invocation be forbidden and denyed to the greater, it is thereby much more forbidden to the less; that if Invocation of Angels which are the most glorious Creatures be forbidden, the Invocation of Saints which are less glorious is forbidden in it: and we find the Fathers using this very Argument against the Worship of any Creatures tho' never so good, or so much glorified: we find Epiphanius urging this very Instance of Angels not being worshipped against the worship of the Virgin Mary in the He-

¶ 'Εἰ γὰρ Ἀγγέλους προσκυνῶντες ὁ Θεὸς πᾶσι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπὸ Ἀννης γεγεννημένῳ; Epiphani. Hær. 79. p. 1062. Edit. Frob. 1622.

resy of the Collyridians, If (says he) God will not <sup>a</sup> suffer Angels to be worshipped, how much more will he not suffer her to be worshipped that was born of Anna [to wit, the Virgin Mary?] It is but putting the word Invoked instead of Worshipped (which Origen hath already told us are but two words for the

the same thing) and joyning the rest of the *Saints* to the *Virgin Mary*, and then we can argue against the *Romish Invocation of Saints* in *S. Epiphanius's* words, If God will not suffer *Angels* to be *Invoked*, how much more will he not suffer the *Virgin Mary* and the rest of the *Saints* to be *Invoked*. The World indeed is since well mended in relation to the *Virgin Mary*, and she has got the start of the *Angels*, and tho' in *Epiphanius's* time the *Angels* were looked upon as above her, and more glorious Creatures than she, or any other *Saint*; yet since that time she hath got to be worshipped, and to be advanced above all the Orders of the *Angels* in Heaven, the reason of which is very plain, because since *Epiphanius's* days she was made *Queen of Heaven*, which must needs advance her infinitely above the *Angels*, who are no better than the Officers of Heaven, and the Ministers of that Court.

But we need no foreign help to baffle the Objection about *Invocation of Saints* being not forbidden in the passages out of *Origen* against *Celsus*; if we do but observe the passage it self, I mean that out of *Origen's* fifth Book against *Celsus*, and the *Antithesis* in it, the *Romish Objection* will immediately vanish. *Origen* having laid it down for a ground, That *Angels* were not to be worshipped or adored, proceeds in the *Antithesis* to tell us who was to be worshipped, and there delivers it for the doctrine of Christianity, that ALL SUPPLICATION, and PRAYER, and INTERCESSION, and THANKSGIVING was to be made to GOD ALONE. That this Answer did fully exclude *Angels* from any participation of Religious Worship, the *Romanists* will grant; that it does also as fully exclude the *Saints* from any participation of the worship of *Invocation*, is what doth evidently and necessarily follow from it, since if ALL PRAYER was to be made to GOD ALONE, there is no more share for the *Saints* than for the *Angels*, but both alike are



are equally excluded from having Prayer or Invocation made to either of them.

S. Cyprian in his Book concerning the Lord's Prayer, urges the Duty of Prayer to God throughout the whole Discourse, and is so far from mentioning or hinting at any use of Invocation or Prayer to Saints or Angels, that he

\* Ut aliter orare quam docuit, non ignorantia sola est, sed & culpa, quando ipse posuerit & dixerit: Rejicitis Mandatum Dei, ut Traditionem vestram statuitis. D. Cypr. de Orat. Po-  
min. p. 264. Edit. Paril. 1607.

says, that to pray otherwise <sup>r</sup> than our Saviour hath taught us, is not only Ignorance but a Crime: since he hath laid it down [for a warning to us] and said; Ye reject the Commandment of God, that ye may establish your own Tradition. We

know very well that our Saviour taught us to Pray to OUR FATHER in Heaven: and if it be a Crime not to follow his Directions, we are sure that Invocation of Saints is a Crime, since that is a rejecting (to use St. Cyprian's application of the passage out of the Gospel to the same purpose which he did) of our Saviour's Commandment, and a following the Tradition of the Church of Rome.

Novatian in his Tract concerning the Trinity, printed among Tertullian's Works, doth prove that Christ is God from his being Invoked. If Christ

† Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique Invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed DEI, ut adesse OMNI LOCO possit? Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in ORATIONIBUS MEDIATOR INVOCATUR, cum INVOCATIO HOMINIS ad præstandam salutem inefficax judicetur? Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur spes in illum ponitur, cum spes in homine maledicta referatur? Novatianus de Trinitate, cap. 14.

(says he) <sup>r</sup> be only a Man, how is he present every where being Invoked, since this is not the NATURE of MAN, but of GOD, to be PRESENT in EVERY PLACE? If Christ be only a Man, why is a Man Invoked in our Prayers to be a Mediator for us, since the INVOCATION of a MAN to HELP or to SAVE us, is judged to be ineffectual? If Christ be only a Man, why is

Hope placed upon him, whereas Trust in Man is cursed in Scripture? There is not one word in this short passage, which

which is not only against *Invocation of Saints* being any *Doctrine* of the *Fathers*, but does wholly ruine all the grounds for any *Invocation of them*. For if a meer Man can neither be present *every where*, nor can help us with *his Mediation*, nor ought to have *hope* placed in *him*; and yet *every one of these* is required to be in *Him* that may be *Invoked*: then I am sure *Invocation of Saints*, who are but *Men*, is both groundless, and to no purpose.

*Lactantius* in his *Institutions* contending for the *Worship* of the *One sole God of Heaven and Earth*, and against any worship of *Angels* uses this argument, that *God alone with his Son hath the Power over all things*, that there is nothing belonging to *Angels* but the necessity of obedience, and therefore they are against ANY HONOUR being paid to THEM, all their Honour being in God himself.

*Itaq; nullum sibi honorem tribui volant, quorum omnis honor in Deo est. Lactant. l. 2. de Origine Erroris, c. 16. p. 223. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1560.*

*Solus habet rerum omnium cum Filio suo potestatem: nec in Angelis quicquam, nisi parendi necessitas.*

And in his next Chapter, *Lactantius* excludes *Saints*, as much as he does the *Angels* here from any share of *Worship*, when he advises, that we should adore NO OTHER THING, nor WORSHIP ANY THING, but the ONLY DIVINITY of our Creator and our Parent.

*Nihilq; aliud adoremus, nihil colamus, nisi solum Artificis, Parentisq; nostri UNICUM NUMEN.*

tisq; nostri UNICUM NUMEN.

This was the *Doctrine* of the *Fathers* of the *Third Century* of the *Church*, and how little it is consistent with any *Worship* or *Invocation of Saints*, the most ordinary Reader will apprehend: We must next inquire into the *Doctrine* of the *Fourth Century*, and see whether theirs agree with what I have hitherto set down.

*S. Athanasius* the most famous *Father* of the *Fourth IV. Century*, in his *Fourth Oration* against the *Arians*, proving

ving the Unity of the Father and the Son from that passage in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, Now God himself  
 \* 1 Thess. 3. 11. and our Father, and \* our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you, gives this reason for it:

\* Οὐκ ἂν γὰρ εὐχαλῶ τις λαβεῖν ὡς τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τοῖς Ἀγγέλων, ἢ ὡς τινὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτισμάτων, ἐδὲ ἂν εἴποι τις δάη σοι ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ Ἀγγέλῳ· ἀλλὰ ὡς Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ διὰ τὴν ἐνότητά καὶ τὴν ἐνοσιδήσιν. Διὰ γὰρ υἱὸς διδόναι τὰ διδόμενα, ἐδὲν δὲ ἔστιν, ὁ μὴ διὰ υἱὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ἐνεργεῖ. D. Athanas. Orat. 4. contra Arianos, p. 259, 260. Edit. Commelini, 1601.

\* For one would not pray to receive any thing from the Father, and the Angels, or from any of the other Creatures, nor would one say, God and the Angel give thee this or that; but [one would pray to receive any thing] from the Father and the Son, because of that Unity, and uniform manner of giving, that is betwixt them two. For by the Son are all Gifts given, and there is no one thing, which the Father doth not work by the Son. After this the Father goes on to answer the Objection from Jacob's praying to the

Angel to bless the Lads, and proves, that that Angel was no other than God the Son: and then to confirm it, shews, that Jacob did invoke no body but God to deliver him from his Brother Esau; that David did pray to no one but God for his deliverance, and that he returned his Praises to GOD ALONE for the blessing of it: and concludes, that it doth not belong to any other person, but to GOD ALONE, to bless and to bestow Deliverances.

I cannot read these passages of this excellent Father without reflecting upon these extravagant Applications to Saints, and especially to the Virgin Mary, which are so frequently or rather constantly to be met with in the Writers of the Church of Rome; and can least of all forgive Cardinal Bona's Preface to the Virgin Mary, which is such an undecent and almost blasphemous piece of Courtship as is not to be parallel'd in any serious and learned Writer of these days, excepting F. Alexandre, who  
 in

in the Conclusion of one of his Volumes tells the *Virgin Mary* what wonderful things she had done for him, and how mightily he was beholding to her, with a great deal more of such fulsome stuff. I am sure such things were far from being the Practice of the Church in S. *Athanasius's* time, since his Doctrine is so directly contrary to any such thing: and tho' now what so common as God and the *Virgin*, God and such, or such a Saint help you, *Jesus*, *Maria*, and the like; yet we see in S. *Athanasius*, that no Christians were guilty of such an extravagancy as to say, God and the Angel give you this or that: and as they did not then pray to Angels, or any other Creatures (in which number the Saints must be included) so neither did they offer up their Thanksgivings to any of them for any Blessings, whereas now nothing is so ordinary as Praises to the Saints for this and t'other blessing, and scarce a Book can be writ without thanks at the beginning or end of it to some of their Saints, or the *Virgin Mary* for their great assistance, and their continual protection; and as if the Saints were equal with God, or did equally communicate every blessing to a Writer, such or such a Book is said to be written for the greater Glory of God and the *Virgin* for example; and I have at this instant Cardinal *Capisucchi's* Book in my hands, which was written, forsooth, *ad majorem Dei, Deiparæ ac S. Thomæ Angelici Doctoris Gloriam*, for the Greater Glory of God, the *Virgin-Mother*, and S. *Thomas Aquinas*. But such things were neither so from the beginning nor of a long time after.

In the same Century *Hilary* the Deacon in his Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, exposing the folly of those who were curious in searching out the natural reasons of things, and the Courses of the Stars, and the Qualities of the Elements, and yet did neglect the Lord of all those beings, gives us their pretences for it. They are

wont (says he) notwithstanding when they are put to the blush for their neglecting of God<sup>1</sup>, to make use of this miserable Excuse, that they can by these go to God, as Men get to the King by his Officers. Well then! Is any Man so mad, or so unmindful of his Safety, as to give the King's Honour to an Officer, whereas if any have been found but to treat of such a thing, they are justly condemned to be guilty of Treason? And yet these Men do not think themselves guilty who give to a Creature the Honour of God's Name, and leave the Lord and adore their Fellow-servants; as though there were any thing more, that can be reserved to God. For, therefore do we go to the King by his Tribunes or Officers, because the King is but a Man, and knows not to whom he ought to commit the Care of the Commonwealth. But for God, to whom nothing

is hid, and who knows the Merits of all Men, there is no need of a Spokesman, but of a devout mind to procure his favour. For whosoever such an one shall address to God, He will answer him.

And this same Father in his Questions out of the Old and New Testament insists upon the same Argument, telling the Heathens, That the Christians<sup>2</sup> worship ONE GOD

<sup>2</sup> Christiani autem—UNUM DEUM colunt in Mystero, ex quo sunt omnia, nec aliquid quod ab eo conditum est, venerantur. Ipsum enim solum sufficere sibi & abundare sciunt ad Salutem, non ignorantes, quia si Gloriam & Nomen ejus aliis deputaverint, offendant eum, quia nullus Imperator permittit, ut cum Nomine ejus Tribuni & Comites adorentur. Idem. lib. Quaestionum Vet. & Nov. Testam. apud Augustini Opera in Appendice ad Tom. 4. p. 46. Edit. Colon. 1616.

dantly.



dantly sufficient for their Salvation, and are not ignorant, that if they give his Glory and his Name to others, they offend Him, since no Emperour does permit, that his Tribunes and Officers be adored together with Himself.

S. Basil did look upon Prayer to be so peculiar to God, that he defines Prayer to be a Request of some good, which is made by pious Men unto God<sup>a</sup>: and his Brother Gregory Nyssen gives the same definition of Prayer which Clemens Alexandrinus had, that It is a Conversing with God<sup>b</sup>: and in another place gives us almost the same definition of Prayer that S. Basil did, that Prayer is a Request of some good things<sup>c</sup>, which is offered with Supplication to God. Now had Prayers to Angels or Saints been either the Practice or the Doctrine of this Age in which these Fathers lived, both S. Basil's and his Brother's Definitions of Prayer had been ridiculous and false, since they make Prayer peculiar to God alone, whereas it would have been common to God and the Saints, had these been prayed to as well as God in those days.

<sup>a</sup> Idem Orat. 2. de Oratione Dominica, p. 724.

I need not insist much upon what Gregory Nyssen says in his Fifth Oration against Eunomius, that we are commanded in the Word of God not to worship any of those things which are created, but that we are to worship and adore that Nature only, which is uncreate: since we have cleared this sufficiently above from Origen and others.

S. Ambrose is the last Father that I will urge in this Fourth Century. He agrees with the Precedent Fathers about the nature of Prayer, and does deny to Angels and Saints the having any Prayers put up to them, in that short but comprehensive passage: Notwithstanding THOU ALONE, O Lord, art to be INVOCATED,

I 2

THOU

<sup>a</sup> Sed tamen THOU art to be INTREATED, that thou <sup>a</sup> wouldst re-  
 TU SOLUS, present him [to wit the Dead Emperor Theodosius] in his  
 Domine, IN- present him [to wit the Dead Emperor Theodosius] in his  
 VOCANDUS, Sons.  
 TU ROGAN-  
 DUS, ut cum in filiis representantes, D. Ambros. Orat. in Obitu Theodosii, Tom. 3. p. 59.

V. Century. I am now arrived at the Fifth Century of the Church, and must inquire whether in this Age the Doctrine of the Church was altered from what we have shewn it to in the four precedent Centuries in relation to the Worship and Invocation of Saints.

S. Epiphanius does make the Invocation of Angels to be the Herefie of the Angelicks; but those people had very hard measure from that Father, if Invocation of Saints was not as much a Herefy, since if it were lawful to invoke the one of these two, the Angels ought to have had the preference, since as they are God's ministring Spirits, they see and hear us, whereas the departed Saints do neither see nor hear us.

The same Father in his Confutation of the Herefie of the Collyridians, concludes fully against the Worship of any Creature. For neither is Elias to be worshipped, tho'

he is reckoned <sup>c</sup> among the living, nor John --- nor any other of the Saints. That ancient error shall not prevail over you to forsake the living God, and to worship the things which were made by Him. For they served and worshipped the Creature more than the Creatour, and became Fools. For if God will not have us to worship the Angels, how much more would He not have us to worship Her that was Born of Anna. --- Let Mary be had in honour, but let the Lord be worshipped. And in his Confutation of the

<sup>c</sup> Ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡλίας προσκυ-  
 νῆτος καὶ περὶ ἐν ζῶσιν ὦν, ὅτι ἰω-  
 ἀννης προσκυνητὸς --- ὅτι τις τῶν  
 ἁγίων προσκυνεῖται. ἢ ὃς κυ-  
 ερίοις ἡμῶν ἢ ἀρχαῖα πλάτη,  
 καταλιμπάνειν τὸ ζῶντα καὶ  
 προσκυνεῖν τὰ ὑπὸ αὐτῷ γεγο-  
 τότα, ἐλάτρευε, ὃς καὶ ἐσιβί-  
 δησε τὴν κτίσει πατέρα. τὴν κτίσαντα  
 καὶ ἐμωρανθήσε. Ἐἰ ὃς Ἀγγέλους  
 προσκυνεῖσθαι ὁ δεῖται, πῶς  
 μᾶλλον τὸ δόξον Ἀννης γεγεννη-  
 μένην. --- Ἡ ΜΑΡΙΑ ἐν τιμῇ, Ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΚΥΤΕΙ-  
 ΣΘΩ. Epiphan. Her. 79. p. 1062.

Herefie

Hereſie of the *Arians*, He does prove the Divinity of Chriſt from his being Worſhipped. For if (ſays he) He be not true God, neither is he to be worſhipped, and if He be a Creature, He is no God; and if He be not to be worſhipped, how comes it to paſs that he is called God? — For it is a fooliſh thing to make a Creature God, and to reject the firſt Commandment, which ſays, Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve. Whereupon the Holy Church of God doth not worſhip a Creature, but the Begotten Son, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Ghoſt.

Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ Θεός, ὅτι περὶ κυριότητος ὄντι. καὶ εἰ ἔστι κτίσις, ὁ Θεός, καὶ εἰ οὐκ ἔστι περὶ κυριότητος, πῶς ἀεὶ δοξολογεῖται; — μᾶλλον γὰρ τὸ κτίσιν δοξολογεῖν, ἀθετεῖν τὸ πρῶτον ἐντολὴν τῶν λόγων, Κυριὸν τὸ θεὸν σε περὶ κυριότητος, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. διὸ καὶ ἀγία τὸ Θεῷ ἐκκλησία ὁ κτίσις περὶ κυριότητος, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἡγνῆτον, Πατέρα ἐν Υἱῷ, Υἱὸν ἐν Πατρὶ, σὺν Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι. Epiphani. Hær. 69. p. 755, 759.

I appeal to all men of ſenſe, whether this Argument to prove the Divinity of Chriſt from his being worſhipped had not been the vainest and moſt frivolous that ever was uſed, had Saints or Angels been worſhipped in thoſe Days, had they had Prayers put up unto them, which is the higheſt Expreſſion of Worſhip.

S. Chryſoſtom doth define Prayer as the reſt of the Fathers had done before him, and ſays \* that Prayer is a diſcourſing with God: and up and down his Works he doth frequently urge it upon Men to go directly to God himſelf, and to make their Prayers unto Him. When (ſaith he) we have any ſuit to make to Men, we have need of expence and ſervile Flattery, and much hurrying hither and thither, and much contrivance. For it happens often that we cannot get ſtreight unto the Lords themſelves to preſent our Gift, and ſpeak with them, but it is neceſſary for us firſt to procure an intereſt in their Servants and Stewards,

Ἡ Εὐχὴ διάλεξις ἐστὶ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. D. Chryſoſt. Hóm. 30. in Geneſim. ἡ Ἀνθρώπων μὲν γὰρ δούμοι καὶ δαπάνης χρημάτων δόμοι. καὶ κατακείας δουλοπρεπῶς, καὶ πολλῆς περιόδου καὶ πραραμψίας. καὶ ἡ γὰρ ἐξ οὐθείας ὡλοῖς τοῖς Κυρτοῖς.

Κυριοῖς δ' ὕναι τ' χάριν ἐνι, καὶ *Stewards, both by Gifts and by Intrèaties*  
 ἀγαλεχθῆναι πλάκῃς, ἀλλ' *and by all other means possible: and then*  
 ἀνάγκη πρὸς τερὸν ἀγαθόνος καὶ *by their mediation we may obtain our re-*  
 οὐκ ἐκ νόμου αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπιτέλους καὶ *quest. But it is not thus with God, for*  
 χρημάτων, καὶ ῥήμασι, καὶ παντὶ *there is no need of Intercessours for the*  
 δεραπεῦσαι τρέπω, καὶ τότε δι' *Petitioners, nor is God so ready to gra-*  
 ἐκείνων διυνηθῆναι τ' αὐτοῖς λα- *tify our Petition, when intreated by o-*  
 βεῖν. Ἐπὶ δ' τῷ Θεῷ ἐκ ἑστῶ *thers, as he is to do it when we pray to*  
 ἑτῶς· ἐν δὲ δεῖται Μεσιτῶν ἐπὶ *him our selves.*  
 τῶν ἀξιώνων, ἐδὲ ἔτω δι' ἐτέρων  
 ὡρακαλέμεθα, ὡς δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν δεομένων ἐπινεύει τῇ χάριτι. D. Chry-  
 sost. in Matthæum, citat. à Theodoro Daphnopato in Eclogis in Tom. 7.  
 Operum Chrysost. p. 768. Edit. Savil.

I will but instance in *One Father*, St. *Austin*, about whom this whole Controversy touching *Invocation* was begun betwixt me, and *Sabran* the *Jesuit*. This *Father* in his *Enchiridion* to *Laurentius*, shewing, that the things which appertain to *Hope*, are all included in the *Lord's Prayer*, and that the *Scriptures* pronounce him accursed, who putteth his *Trust* in *MAN*, concludes from it, that for that very Reason<sup>i</sup>, we ought not to ask or pray to any other but our Lord God alone for whatever we hope either to do well, or to be rewarded for after we have done so.

<sup>i</sup> Ideo non nisi à Domino Deo petere debemus, quicquid speramus nos vel bene operaturos, vel pro bonis operibus adepturos. D. Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 114. Tom. 3. p. 73.

In another part of his *Works*, in the very last that he wrote, He asks this question of the *Heathen*; Can we then believe that these *Angels*, whose employment is to declare to Mankind the Will of the Father, <sup>k</sup> would have us be subject and serve any other besides Him, whose Will they declare to us? the *Platonician* himself doth give us herein the best *Admonition*, That the *ANGELS* are to be *IMITATED* rather than *INVOCATED*.

<sup>k</sup> Num igitur hos Angelos, quorum ministerium est declarare voluntatem Patris, credendum est velle nos subdi nisi ei, cujus nobis annunciant voluntatem? Unde optimè admonet etiam ipse Platonicus, IMITANDOS Eos potius quam INVOCANDOS. Idem de Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 25.

If this Father was so very earnest against any *Invocation of Angels*, we have reason to believe, that upon his own reasons urged above *against placing any Trust in MAN*, he was as positive, if not much more against *Invocation of Saints*, since according to him, the *Angels* who are so constantly employed in the affairs of men, cannot but see and understand our wants; whereas the *Saints*, according to Him, *know nothing of us*, and therefore cannot be *Invoked* by us, except we are resolved to throw away our *Prayers*, and to pray to *those* who do not hear us. It is his own *Doctrine* in his *Treatise* about *taking care of the Dead*, in which after several *Arguments Pro and Con* he concludes, <sup>1</sup> *That we must acknowledge, that the Dead are ignorant of what is done here upon earth*; He had just before this *Conclusion* argued, that if the dead had any knowledge of things on earth, he should not have wanted the constant assistance of his dear Mother *Monica* in his troubles: and that if (as the *Scriptures* assure us) the *Patriarchs themselves* were ignorant of their *Posterity*, and knew nothing of the Condition good or bad of the *People of Israel*: we have a great deal of reason to conclude, that *all the Dead* were in the same Condition.

This certainly was that *Father's Opinion*, and this *Doctrine* I am sure is perfectly inconsistent with *Invocation of Saints*, since it takes away the very foundation it self on which *Invocation* is built, to wit, that the *Dead* do know our wants, and do hear us, and are able to relieve us. I will conclude the *Testimonies* upon this Head against *Invocation of Saints* with that severe question which *Hilary the Deacon* put to those who were wont to worship the *Elements*, because they believed that the Government or Patronage of mens lives was intrusted with them. We demand of them, whether this be commanded or ordered

<sup>1</sup> Proinde fatendum est, nescire quidem mortuos quid hic agatur. Idem de Cura pro Mort. c. 15.



<sup>a</sup> A quibus ut supra requirimus si mandatum est aut jussum à Deo, quem etiam ipsi magnum & summum facerentur & negligunt. Si enim fieri debet, ab illo mandari oportuit, qui Author eorum dicitur. Si autem ab illo non est mandatum, præsumptio est, & ad poenam proficiet, non ad præmium, quia ad contumeliam pertinet Conditoris, ut contempto Domino colantur servi, & spreto Imperatore adorentur Comites. *Hilar. Diacon. Quæstion. Vet. & Nov. Testam. apud August. in Append. ad Tom. 4. p. 45.*

It is but altering a few words in this passage, and we may put the same question to the Church of Rome about their *Invocation* and *worship* of *Saints*. We require to know, whether their *Invocation of Saints* be commanded and appointed by God; for if *Invocation of Saints* ought to be practised, it ought to be commanded by him who made them *Saints*: but if it is *no where* commanded by him, *Invocation of Saints* is a **PRESUMPTION**, and will bring a Punishment on their Heads that practise it, since it is a Contempt and affront to God to have his Servants made sharers with him in his **W O R S H I P**.

Thus I have gone through the *Doctrine* of the *Primitive Fathers* down to St. *Austin's* time in the *Fifth Age* of the Church, and have found their *Doctrine* to be like their *Practice*: we had no reason to expect to meet with any *Practice* of *Invocation of Saints* or *Angels* in their days, since we find their *Doctrines* so fully and so unanimously against any such thing; I am not conscious to my self of having either curtail'd, or misapply'd, or perverted one of all the passages I have produced out of the *Fathers* of the *Five Centuries*; I hope the Reader hath carried them in his memory, that so he may help me

me to compare them with what *Sabran* the Jesuit had the Assurance in both *his Letters* to say concerning *St. Austin*, and the *Fathers of his* and the *precedent Century*, that *Invocation of Saints* was taught by *S. Austin*, and *ALL the Fathers of his Age*, and the *Precedent Century*.

And is all this certainly true? Yes surely, or else the *Jesuit* would have scorn'd to have asserted it so boldly in both *his Letters*: but alas, it will not prove so, since what I have collected out of the *Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries* will prove this to be a scandalous falshood; for to argue the matter a little with *him*, did *S. Athanasius* teach *Invocation of Saints*, who tells us, that *no good Christian* ever prayed to *Angels*, or *any other Creatures* (of which number are the *Saints*) together with *God*, who proves the *Divinity* of our *Saviour* from his being *Invoked*? did *Hilary* the *Deacon* teach *Invocation of Saints*, who does so very well expose the *very ground of Invocation* of going to *God* by the *Saints*, and ridicules the *Comparison* drawn from *Addresses* made to *Temporal Princes* by the mediation of their *Officers*, and shews, that the comparison is groundless, since *Temporal Princes* are forc'd to make use of *their Officers* in such things, because they are but men, whereas *God* knows the *Merits* of *all men*, and therefore no need of a *Spokesman* to him?

Did *S. Basil* or *Gregory Nyssen* teach *Invocation*, or a *Praying to Saints*, who define *Prayer* to be a *Request for some good thing* TO GOD?

*These* are the most *noted Fathers* of the *Fourth Century*; and for the *Fifth*, did *S. Epiphanius* teach *Invocation of Saints*, who proves the *Divinity of Christ* (as *S. Athanasius* had done) from his being worshipped; the most solemn expression of *Worship* being *Invocation* or *Prayer*? did *S. Ambrose* after he rightly understood the *Christian*

*Religion* teach any such *Invocation*, who said, that *GOD ALONE* was to be *INVOCATED*? Did *S. Chrysostom* teach it, who does so often exhort to *our going to God our selves*, assuring us *we shall be sooner heard when we ask our selves, than when we ask by another*; who does with the rest of the *Fathers* make the *Essence of Prayer* to be a *Discoursing with God*? Did *S. Austin* lastly, whom the *Jesuit* names, teach *Invocation* or *Prayer to Saints*, who says expressly, that *we ought to Pray to, or ask of GOD ALONE those things we hope for*?

I am so much accustomed to the *Writers of the Church of Rome*, that I do not so much wonder as I otherwise should at the *Jesuits* asserting a thing so very false with so much assurance: it is too frequent among them to challenge ALL the *Fathers*, when perhaps not one in twenty is on their side, and therefore for the *Jesuit* to assert, That all the *Fathers of those two Centuries* are for *Invocation of Saints*, is meerly a being in the fashion. But can he think to impose upon us with such things? does he think that *Confidence* is enough, or all that is necessary for the carrying of any cause? if he does, he shall find himself mistaken, since there is too much learning in *England* to let such bold and false assertions to pass upon and delude the people without controul, or putting a stop to them.

I need not aggravate, or further insist on the falseness of all that the *Jesuit* said there; I had rather employ my self to vindicate the *Fathers* than to expose him: and therefore in order to the doing that by answering all the passages quoted out of them by the *Jesuit* to defend *Invocation of Saints*, I will only request, that these two very reasonable *Postulatum's* may be granted me.

First, That the *Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries* [about whom the *Controversie* is betwixt me and the

the Jesuit] did know the Practices, and understand the Doctrines of the Fathers of the Three preceding Ages of the Church.

Secondly, That the Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, had so much learning as to understand, and so much sense as not to contradict themselves.

Both these Concessions are so very just, that I hope there will be no dispute about them; I will then with the help of them begin the Examination of all that the Jesuit hath offered out of the Primitive Fathers in defence of Invocation of Saints. And to let the Jesuit see I am not afraid of their best Arguments, I will answer that one which is omitted, I wonder how by himself, but was not only urged in the *Nubes Testium*, but is twice repeated by the Compiler in his *Vindication* of the *Nubes Testium*. It is the passage from S. Ambrose's Book *de Viduis*, wherein he says, *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro nobis. Martyres obsecrandi, the Angels are to be pray'd to, who are appointed for our defence; the Martyrs are to be pray'd to, whose Patronage we justly claim.* This passage doth make the greatest shew of any for the Church of Rome, however in answer to this we tell them, that what S. Ambrose wrote in that Book, was not the Doctrine of the Christian Church, which S. Ambrose did not understand when he wrote that Book, being then but a Novice, as not only this passage about Angels, but some others in it do very evidently shew, and therefore this passage ought not to be insisted on as the Doctrine of the Church then, since He doubtless did not at that time understand the Church's Doctrines, nor ought it to be insisted on as S. Ambrose's Opinion at least, since it is evident, that he did afterwards change his mind, when he understood Christianity better, and did then declare his sense to be, that GOD ALONE was to be INVOCATED or PRAY'D TO.

This Answer is fair, and cannot be reasonably gain-say'd,

say'd, however since the *Jesuit* and the *Compiler* will be angry at my saying S. *Ambrose* was a *Novice*, and did not understand the *Doctrines* of the *Christian Church*, when he wrote that *Book* ; I will, to prevent their Cavils, offer some further reasons in defence of that *Answer* I have just made. I will not insist upon the *Concessions* of their own *Learned Men* of the *Church* of *Rome*, of *Baronius* for Example, who do own, that S. *Ambrose* was a *Novice*, when he wrote that *Book*, and therefore did not thoroughly understand the *Christian Doctrine* ; I have better reasons, the chief of which is, that this doctrine of praying to *Angels* and *Martyrs*, is expressly contrary to the doctrine of the *Church*, and the *Practice* of it in St. *Irenaeus's* time, who tells us, that the *Church* then made no use of any *Invocation* of *Angels* ; in *Origen's* time, who informs us, that the *Church's Doctrine* was, that *Angels* were not to be PRAY'D TO, nor *Martyrs* neither, but that ALL PRAYER was to be offered up to GOD ALONE through our Lord *Jesus Christ* ; and in St. *Athanasius's* time, who lived but a little time before S. *Ambrose*, and who shews us, that no *Christian* then did Pray to *Angel*, or *Martyr*, or *Saint*, or any other *Creature* : but which is worst of all, this *Doctrine* of praying to *Angels* is directly contrary to a *Canon* of a *Council* of *Bishops* at *Laodicea*, held not above ten years before St. *Ambrose's* *Conversion* to *Christianity*, by which *Canon* an *Anathema* is denounced against any person that should Pray to *Angels*, and as if the *Council* \* had a mind thoroughly to have secured all *Christians* from slipping into it, they call the *Praying to Angels* a *secret Idolatry* and a *forsaking of Christ*.

\* Can. 35.  
Concil. Laodicean. held A.D.  
364.

This is sufficient to shew, that *Praying to Angels* was far enough from being either a *Practice* or a *Doctrine* of the *Primitive Church*, since it was accursed and branded with the title of *Idolatry* ; and to shew further, that it was



was not S. Ambrose's own Opinion, when he understood Christianity better, we need only look into that Oration I quoted above, where he doth expressly teach, that GOD ALONE is to be Invoked and Prayed to.

Had the Compiler of the *Nubes Testium* known the true State and Doctrines of the Primitive Church during the first four Ages, He would never have been guilty of bringing in S. Ambrose for a Teacher of Invocation and Praying to Angels, which the Church had not only always opposed, but had just before S. Ambrose's own time accused as secret Idolatry, and a forsaking of Christ: but such passages as this, and downright Heresy sometimes are quoted, if they do but promise any the least service to the defence of the present Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome: Unhappy Church! that art forc'd to make use of such, or to have none.

It is time for me now to attend the Jesuit, and see what he produces to shew, that Invocation or Prayer to Saints, was taught in the Fourth and Fifth Ages.

He begins with S. Austin, but so little is the Jesuit's Skill, and so ill his Fortune, that he first quotes a passage that breaks the neck of his whole design. For in that answer to Faustus the Manichee, who had objected to the Christians the Worshipping of their Martyrs, he owns indeed (as the Jesuit quotes him) that they did worship the Martyrs, but he tells him also, that it was only with the Worship of Love and Fellowship, which is paid also to the Holy Men of God while on earth. I ask the Jesuit therefore what Church ever did, and whether even their Church of Rome doth order Invocation or Prayers to be put up to their Fellow Christians, tho' the most holy on Earth? Let him but name me the Church that ever practised or appointed this, and I will be his Convert upon it, but since no Church in the World was ever so forsaken of God as to command this, and since the wor-  
ship

# The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

ship paid to the dead Saints was the very same that is paid to the Living Saints, it is evident to a Demonstration, that there was nothing of Invocation in it, and consequently no Patronage for Invocation of Saints from this place, but the direct contrary to it.

The Jesuit had in his Printed Sermon, and in his Letter to the Lord, quoted two of S. Austin's Sermons, de Sanctis, for the same purpose; for the passage in relation to the Virgin Mary out of the 35<sup>th</sup> Sermon, de Sanctis, I have sufficiently answered that already, by proving that whole Sermon to be a Forgery; and for the other passage out of the 18<sup>th</sup> Sermon de Sanctis, I told him before that it is none of S. Austin's; and for the Passage it self set down by the Jesuit in his Letter to the Protestant Peer it is almost word for word in the 35<sup>th</sup> Sermon, de Sanctis, so that there was Stealing in the case, either the 18<sup>th</sup> stole from the 35<sup>th</sup>, or the 35<sup>th</sup> served the 18<sup>th</sup> that Trick: but to convince the World how little that Passage could pretend to be S. Austin's, or near his Age, I will give the Reader that Piece which the Jesuit left out of the middle of his Quotation; It is an Address to the Virgin Mary, in these Words, Excuse us from what we fear, for thou art the ONLY HOPE of Sinners, THROUGH THEE we hope for pardon of our Sins, and in THEE, O most Blessed Virgin, is the Expectation <sup>a</sup> of our Rewards. This is such Doctrine, as had no Being in S. Austin's days, and happy had it been for the whole Church, had such absurd Doctrine been always kept out, and I am glad to see the Jesuit so much ashamed of it, as to leave it out of the middle of his Quotation.

<sup>a</sup> Excusa quod  
timemus, quia  
TU es SPES  
UNICA pec-  
catorum, per  
TE speramus  
veniam deli-  
ctorum, & in  
TE, Beatissima,

nostrorum est Expectatio Premiorum. Serm. 18. de Sanctis.

His next Author for Invocation of Saints is Origen, and which is still more strange, his Eighth Book against Cel-  
sus,

*saw*, which, as I shewed above, was particularly written against the *Invocation of Angel or Saint*; but *some men* are very unhappy, and it is a just Judgment that *they* that only steal from one another should suffer, and be exposed for their Imprudence. What the Jesuit quotes is, *That if Men would gain the Favour of many, they were taught in Scripture that thousands of thousands assisted before him*: but what is all this to the purpose? What is said here is, *That the Angels assist good Men with their Prayers*, which is nothing at all to *Invocation of Angels*: nay the place is so far from countenancing any such thing, that *Origen's Design* through that whole eighth Book, is to shew, that *no Worship nor Invocation* is to be offered up to *Angels or Saints*, and upon *Celsus's* urging that *Men should worship and pray to the Angels that they might be propitious to them*, *Origen* answers him with a *Detestation of his Counsel* (as I have put it down at large above) shewing him that all our *Prayers* were to be offered to *God*, and for the obtaining the Assistance of the *Angels*, he tells him, a *Holy Life* is the best Means.

And is not *this Jesuit* then very skilful in *these things*? could any other Person have had the face to quote that very place for an Instance and Proof of *Invocation of Angels and Saints*, which was intended by the *Author* directly against it. I believe the *Jesuit* never saw *Origen* himself, I intreat him to look into that Page out of which his Quotation is taken, and then I am sure he will see very good reason to thank me for saying no more to him upon this Account.

His next Testimony is out of *S. Basil's Oration* upon the *Forty Martyrs*, that whoever was in *Affliction* had recourse to them: whoever was in *Prosperity*, betook himself likewise to them; the one that he might find Relief, the other to beg continuance of his Happiness, &c. There was occasion

occasion for Craft in the *Translation* of *this Place*, however I do not charge it upon the *Jesuit* who had it from the *Compiler*, nor the *Compiler* who had it from *Father Alexandre*, nor *F. Alexandre* himself who had it from *Bellarmino*, or some other of *their Writers*, who all conspire in the *same Abuse* of *S. Basil's Words*. There is not a Syllable for *Invocation* here, for *S. Basil* in this place to perswade the People to frequent the *Anniversaries* of the *Martyrs*, tells them, that the *Church of the Martyrs*, that is, where the *Martyrs Bodies* or *Asbes* were laid, was a ready help to *Christians*, but how? Because those that came to offer up *their Prayers* at the *Memories* of the *Martyrs*, had the assistance of the *Martyrs Prayers*, whom *S. Basil* believed to joyn their *Prayers* to those that were put up at *their Memories*; and upon this account it is that *He* says people betook themselves to the *Martyrs*, not by *praying to the Martyrs*, as the *Jesuit* and the *Romish Writers* would insinuate, but by *frequenting their Assemblies*, and by *running to the Churches of the Martyrs*: for immediately after he plainly enough prevents his being misunderstood, as tho' he was telling how the people prayed to the *Martyrs*, by annexing this to it. Let your *Prayers* therefore <sup>b</sup> be put up or joyn'd with the *Martyrs Prayers*. Here had been his place to have explained himself if he would have had them to have *prayed* to the *Martyrs*: but we see his direction was not that they should *pray To*, but *WITH* the *Martyrs*, which is directly against *Invocation* of them: and therefore was cunningly, tho' not honestly, left out of the middle of the passage, by the *Compiler*, and the *Jesuit* after him.

<sup>b</sup> META  
MARTY-  
PQN γε-  
νέσθω τὰ αἰ-  
μήματα ὑ-  
μῶν. S. Ba-  
sil. Orat. 20  
in 40. Mar-  
tyres, p. 459.

That which he quotes next from *Gregory Nazianzen* about *Cyprian*, and *Justina the Virgin*, that he while He was a *Magician* did tempt her to uncleanness, and she escaped him by *praying to the Virgin Mary*, is every bit of it a sham, since the *learned men* of the *Church* do own that there

there was no ground in *History* for it, but that it was a perfect *Mistake* throughout.

As to the next *Quotation* out of *Gregory Nyssen's Oration* upon *Theodorus* of his asking that *Saint's Intercession* for their *Country*, it is so plainly a *Rhetorical Apostrophe*, as nothing can be more, and is put down in such familiar *Style*, as if he was talking not praying to the *Martyr*, and to convince us that it must be only a *Rhetorical Expression* or *Request* to the *Martyr*, he does suppose the *Martyr himself* to be present there, and to hear what he said as well as any of the *Congregation* did; and to help out that Supposition he further supposes that the *Martyr* (wheresoever his *Mansion* was) had got leave to come down, and be present at their *Assemblies*; all which are pleasant *Fancies*, but are such as shew that *Gregory Nyssen* would have thought it vain even to have talked with, or called to the *Martyr*, had he not had leave to have been present with them; which is further cleared from his desiring *Theodorus* to get the rest of the *Martyrs*, *S. Peter*, *S. Paul*, and *S. John* to pray for the several *Churches* planted by them; by which very *Expressions* he shews his belief that they did not hear him, because they were not present, and therefore he was forc'd to desire of *Theodorus* to do it. All which with more which I could add out of this very *Oration* upon *Theodore the Martyr*, is absolutely inconsistent with that *Invocation of Saints* which is practised in the *Church of Rome*, by which any *Saint* is called upon in any place, and in *Ten thousand places* at the same time.

We must allow for *Rhetorical Expressions*, and *Harangues*, and ought not to suspect that *Gregory Nyssen* doth here contradict his own *Doctrine*, as well as of all the *Fathers* before him, by which he makes *Invocation* or *Prayer* peculiar to *God*, when he defines *Prayer* to be, *quædam Cœli, a Conversing with God* exclusive to *Saint* or *Angel*.

L

His



His next Quotation from S. Ambrose I have already answered above, where I told the Reader that the Jesuit had omitted it, but that was partly a Mistake; but the Jesuit himself is in the fault, for in his Margent here he puts Ambros. de m. Cyprian, whereas it should have been Ambros. l. de Viduis. I never met with such a blundering Margent in my days; had I not had the Nubes Testium to have directed me, I should no more have understood his next Quotation from Theod. de cur. grac. than I did this from Ambrose. The Jesuit either does not understand how to quote an Author intelligibly, or hath a very unlucky Printer: however H. Hills ought not to have the blame, since his other Prints are just enough as to these Marginal References.

The Jesuit then next quotes Theodoret's Words, in Serm. 8. de Martyribus, about the Temples of the Martyrs being frequented, and about the People praying to the Martyrs upon all occasions. But to this we answer, That if the whole Book, de Curandis Gracorum Affectionibus, be not deservedly doubted to be none of Theodoret's, yet there is a very great Reason to believe that this Book about the Martyrs hath been tamper'd with; since in a Book of his, which is unquestionable, we meet with Doctrines inconsistent with any such Prayer to Saints as is made in the Church of Rome. I mean his Commentary on the 17<sup>th</sup> Verse of the Third Chapter of S. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, where upon those Words, And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him: He thus comments, For because they [against whom S. Paul warns the Colossians] did command Men <sup>c</sup> to

<sup>c</sup> Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰς Ἀγγέλους σέβειν ἐκέλευον, αὐτοὺς τὸ ἐναντίον παρελθόντα, ὡς καὶ τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰ ἔργα κοσμήσας τῇ

worship the Angels, He enjoyns the contrary, that they should adorn both their Words and Actions with the Commemoration of Christ their Lord. And send

μήνη

up

up (saith he) *Thanksgiving to God and the Father by HIM, and not by the ANGELS. The Synod of Laodicea also in pursuance of this Rule, and being desirous to cure that old Disease, made it a Law that none should pray unto Angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ. Theodoret urges this same Canon of the Council of Laodicea against the Worshipping of Angels spoken of in the 2<sup>d</sup> Chapter to the Colossians.*

μήμη τῷ θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι καὶ ἑυχαριστοῦν δι' αὐτῶν, φησὶν, ἀναπέμπετε, μὴ διὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων. Τέτρω ἐπομνήνη τῶν νόμων καὶ ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ Σύνοδος, καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκείνο πᾶσι. Δεσποῦσαι βυλομένη, ἐνομοθέτησε, μὴ εὐχαριστῆν Ἀγγέλοις, μηδὲ καταλιμπάνειν τὸ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Theodo-

ret. in 3. cap. Ep. ad Coloss. in Tom. 3. p. 359. Edit. Paris. 1642.

So that if we may judge of *Theodoret's True Sentiments* about these things from his *undoubted Comments*, we are very sure he was utterly against *Invocation of Angels*, and consequently against *Invocation of Saints*, since the *same Reasons* lye against *them both*, but are much stronger against the *Invocation of Saints*, who must be allowed to be the *less Glorious*, and *less knowing* in *humane Affairs*.

But granting, notwithstanding all this, that *Theodoret's Eighth Discourse about the Martyrs* is genuine, and that there have been *no Frauds* committed in it, yet the Reason of his *Praying to the Martyrs* there will not defend the *present Invocation* of the Church of Rome, since he makes the *Martyrs* to be *present at their Memorials*, and to *hear the Requests* made to *them there*; which was not only *his*, but *some other Fathers Opinions*: and *this* cannot properly be called *Invocation*, since the *Saint* is supposed to be within the *Lines of Communion*, and *all* that passes to be no more than a *Request* from *one Friend* to *another*; nor can it be called *Prayer* any otherwise than *improperly* as we use it in *Conversation*, when *one man prays another* to do such or such a thing for *him*.

And therefore tho' *Invocation* or *Prayer* be reserved in *Scripture* to *God alone*, and was lookt upon as *such* by the *Primitive Fathers*, yet were any man certain that *S. Paul*, for Example, was *present* though *invisibly* in the *same place* he is in, I do not believe it would be any more against *Scripture* for that Man to *pray* *S. Paul* to assist him with his *Prayers* at the *Throne of Grace*, than it is against *Scripture* for one Man here to *pray* another to do the *same thing* for him; and I think such a *Prayer* or *Request* (call it whether you will) made to *S. Paul* with those *Circumstances* ought no more to be named *Invocation*, than the *Prayer* or *Request* made by one *Christian* to another upon the *same account*: since all the difference betwixt the two *Cases* is only this, that the one is *present invisibly*, the other *visibly*, but both equally *present*.

This *Answer* doth not only satisfy for what is alledged out of *Theodoret*, but is equally serviceable for some other such like passages quoted from *S. Chrysostom* and others, all which are grounded upon that *persuasion* that had gotten footing among them, that the *Martyrs* by *God's permission*, were *present* at their *Memories* during the time of the *Christians Assemblies* there, as I could very distinctly shew, but have not room here to do it: if the *Jesuit* would but read over again his own next quotation from *S. Basil*, he may see the grounds for all that hath been answered by me here.

I need not trouble my self to answer what he further quotes from *S. Austin*, of whose *Doctrine* upon this point we have had a full account already, nor to take any notice of his following *Quotations*, which concern the *Reliques* of the *Saints*.

What I have collected from the *Practice* and *Doctrines* of the *Primitive Fathers* in my *third* and *fourth particular* is sufficient to demonstrate that as *Invocation* of *Saints*.

*Saints* was not the *Practice*, so it was expressly against the *Doctrine* of the *Primitive Fathers*; so that *Invocation* of *Saints* was no more countenanced by *them*, than it is by the *Church of England*, and we have all the reason in the World to conclude that as *they* did not practise *Invocation* of *Saints*, so they were no *Papists*, but of the *same Faith* with the *Church of England* as to these things: and therefore the *Church of England* is not guilty of *Schism* in separating from the *Church of Rome* upon occasion of *Invocation* of *Saints*, since the *Primitive Church* practised no such thing, and she is bound to Communicate with the *Primitive Church* rather than with the *Church of Rome*, who has been guilty of bringing into her own Practice *This* among other Superstitious things, which every *Orthodox Church* is bound to refuse, or to throw out and reform as soon as she is sensible of her *Errour*.

And as for those *Practices* of *Addresses* to the *Martyrs* at their *Memories* cited from *S. Basil*, *S. Gregory Nyssen*, *St. Chrysostom*, and *Theodoret*, and so much insisted on by the *Jesuit* as being the *same thing*, and all that is practised by the *Church of Rome* towards the *Saints* and *Angels*; we can very easily prove a vast difference betwixt what was done *then*, and what is practised *now* by the *Church of Rome*, and since the *Jesuit* doth challenge me so often to shew the difference, I will answer his Challenge, and do assign only three Differences out of more that I could offer.

The *First Difference* is that the *Church of Rome* doth use a direct *Invocation*, or *formal Prayer* to the *Saints* and *Angels*, as is apparent from hundreds of places in their *Missals*, *Breviaries* and *Offices*, whereas the *Primitive Fathers* of the end of the *Fourth* and *Fifth Century* did not *invoke* or *make Prayers* to the *Saints*, but merely such *Addresses* or *Requests* as are made from one

Friend.

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Friend to another* : and this I do prove out of their *own mouths*, who make PRAYER to be PECULIAR to GOD ALONE, and therefore would not contradict *their own Doctrine by their own Practice*, which these Fathers had inevitably done, had they reserved Prayer as proper to GOD ALONE, and yet offered Prayer or Invocation to the Saints.

A second Difference is that, whereas those Requests were made at the Memories of those Martyrs to whom they were presented, and who were believed to be present there tho' invisibly at that time, the Invocations and Prayers to the Saints in the present Church of Rome, are made not only in every place, but in ten thousand different and most distant places to such or such a particular Saint; which is virtually to ascribe to them an Omnipresence, an Attribute that no finite Being is capable of.

The third Difference is that those Requests and Interpellations to the Martyrs were neither commanded by the Primitive Church, Authorized by her General or Provincial, or any other Councils, nor used in the Publick Offices of the Church; whereas; on the contrary, the Invocations and Prayers to Saints in the Church of Rome are enjoined by the Roman Church, are authorized by her last General Council of Trent, and used not only in the Publick Offices of their Church, but in the most solemn Parts of their Offices, in the Litanies of the Church.

I could add more, but these are enough to shew the vast difference betwixt what is now practised in the Church of Rome towards the Saints, and what was done to them at the latter end of the Fourth, and in the Fifth Age of the Church, which is the time of the Primitive Church in dispute betwixt me, and the Compiler, and the Jesuit.

Thus



Thus I have been so civil as to accept the *Jesuit's* Challenge, and to make him a fair and distinct Reply, and have been more civil to him than I ought to have been, since according to the *Law of Arms*, I think the Challenge I made to the *Jesuit* among the rest of the *Romish Priests* in *England* (to shew me but one Canon of the *Catholick Church* for the first six hundred years of the Church for the *Pope's Supremacy*) ought to have been accepted and answered before any of them were allowed to make any Challenges to me. But since it was impossible for the *Jesuit* or any of them to produce such a Canon, and therefore to make any Reply to that Challenge; I will at parting tell the *Jesuit*, that if he intends to prosecute this Controversy about *Invocation of Saints*, it is my turn to challenge, and therefore I do challenge him to shew as fair and as uninterrupted a Practice and Doctrine for *Invocation of Saints*, as I have produced against it for the *Four First Centuries of the Church*, out of the *Liturgies* and *Genuine Works* of the *Fathers* of those distinct Ages.

I must now return to the *Compiler's Vindication* of the *Nubes Testium*, and should pass to the next Chapter about *Reliques*, but that I must not forget to take notice of a very terrible Objection against us in relation to this *Invocation*, which I had like to have omitted. The Reader I suppose does remember, that the *Compiler* had said, that I had granted that *Invocation of Saints* was practised in the *Fourth* and *Fifth Ages of the Church*, upon this he very learnedly observes against me, that even one of the *Four First General Councils* was held within the same time, without ever censuring it as an Error, tho' even before that, this Practice is own'd to have taken root in many Places. This passage is very diverting, and shews with what an air of confidence some men can write the most absurd things, and tack together the most inconsistent: I had thought  
I had

I had taught the *Compiler* a little more care and circumspection when he meddles with *Chronology*-matters in my *Answer* to his *Nubes Testium*, but I perceive nothing will do good upon him, nor learn him more caution. Well then, since he is so wilful, and cannot be persuaded from making such lamentable blunders in *Chronology*, he must e'en thank himself if he be exposed for it, and last but not least for it as he does deserve.

He first then observes, that even one of the Four First General Councils was held within the same time, that is, within the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. By this One of the Four First General Councils, I suppose, he means the Council of Nice; and I must needs tell him, that he guessed very well to say, that that Council was held within the time of those two Centuries, but that he had guessed a great deal better if he had said, that even all the Four First General Councils were held within that time; for there is no body that pretends to any the least skill in *Chronology*, that would not have readily told him that they were all four held and over within two Years after the middle of the Fifth Century.

His next Observation is like this, he tells us, That this General Council did not censure Invocation of Saints as an Error; if he means the Council of Nice, as I before supposed he did, it is a very great Truth that that Council did not censure Invocation of Saints as an Error, and there was a very good Reason for it, and that was, because there was no such thing as Invocation of Saints practised in the Church when that Council was held, nor of above two hundred Years after; but some men love to make wise Observations, tho' they miss their aim too too often. Well! But what will the *Compiler* say, if I shew him that tho' not the first, yet One of these Four General Councils did censure Invocation of Angels, (and consequently of Saints) as an Error, and

as a most gross one too? This I will do, that so *he* may curse his ill Fate for putting him upon making such an *untoward Objection* against us, and learn for the future, if *he* is not deaf to Advice, to look before he leaps into such *recoyling Objections*.

The Council of *Chalcedon* doth in her *first Canon* admit and approve of the *Synod of Laodicea*, and makes the *Canons of that Synod* part of the *standing Law* of the *Universal Church*: now among the *Canons of that Synod* we find the 35<sup>th</sup> directly forbidding *Invocation of Angels*. I will set down the *whole Canon*, not only because it was made by a *Diocesan Synod* of a great many *Bishops*, but because it was confirmed by the *Greatest and last General Council*, consisting of above *Six hundred Bishops*, in the *middle of the Fifth Century*, (which is the *Century* most contested for betwixt *me* and the *Compiler*) and made by them a *Rule* to the *Catholick Church*: and the *Canon* is this, *That Christians ought*

*not to forsake the Church of God, and go into Conventicles and Indurate, or pray to Angels, and make Meetings; all which are forbidden them: If any Man therefore be found to give himself to this Secret Idolatry, let him be accursed, for that he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and hath betaken himself to Idolatry.*

ἡ Ὅτι ὁ δὲ χριστιανὸς ἐγκαταλείπειν ἢ Ἐκκλησίαν τῆ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπέναι καὶ Ἀγγέλους ὀνομαζέειν, καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν ἀπεγορεύεται. Ἐὰν τις ὅτι εὐρεθῇ ταύτῃ τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρεῖα ὁλοκαίρων, ἔστω Ἀνάθεμα, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ ἦν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρεῖα.

περὶ ὧν. Concil. Laodicen. Can. 35. in Biblioth. Juris Canonici. Edit. Justel. 1661.

The *Compiler* hath still another *Observation* to be examined which is as good as either of the other two: It is, That this *Practice* [of *Invocation of Saints*] is own'd to have taken root in many places, even before that [Council of *Nice*]. I will not accuse him here of a *wilful Falshood*,

M

it

it is merely because *he* knew not when *that Council* was held, that makes him write at this extravagant Rate: I do not own that *Invocation of Saints* took root either before or within a hundred Years after *that Council*: and the very first Instance of any *Addresses in Orations*, or otherwise made to the *Saints* that any of the *Romish Writers* are able to produce comes not within forty Years of *that Council*, so that our *Compiler* is a very unlucky Man at these *Chronology* businesses, and should not have ventured so rashly to crowd so many false, and such ridiculous things into so small a compass: and tho' perhaps I shall have no Thanks for my good Intentions, yet could I but in the least suspect that *he* and I should have any further Controversie about these things, rather than *he* should go on in this blundering blindfold manner, I would be at the Expence of presenting him with a *Chronology-Table*, that so no more Paper may be spent in correcting or exposing his Mistakes in *Chronology*. I intreat him to consider of it, and not to venture at such things any more, except he is sure of an *Adversary* just as wise as himself, and that hath just as much Knowledge in *Chronology* and *Antiquity* as himself: then indeed he may write on as *he* has done here, courageously without the fear of being discovered, and they two may serve only to make diversion for their Readers.

The next Chapter in my Book is about *Reliques*, and here the *Compiler* takes me up very quick, and says that I retire within the Three first Centuries, but for the Fourth and Fifth that I dare not put the Cause [about *Reliques*] upon their Verdict. And is not this very pleasant Matter? Suppose I had retired, which I did not, for the Disproof of the *Worship of Reliques* within the Three first Centuries, and durst not stand to the Verdict of the Fourth or Fifth Century; does not *he* himself remember that the Design of his *Rubens Testium* was to shew that the  
Fathers

Fathers of the first five hundred years did teach and practice what the Church of Rome at present doth? And did not he pretend there to the Tradition of the First Five Centuries? How then should I have betray'd or hurt my pretences to the same Ages, had I retired within the Three First Centuries, and disprov'd him as to those Centuries. When a Man at Law pretends to have five hundred years Prescription to the Toll (for Example) of some great Fair, doth not his Adversary sufficiently ruin his five hundred years Prescription, if he can make it appear, that for three of the five hundred years there was no Fair at all kept at that place, and therefore no Toll paid there? The Case betwixt me and my Adversary, as set down by himself, is the very same, and yet I must not be allowed to ruine his first five hundred years Prescription, tho' I could prove, that there was no enquiry after, much less any worship of Reliques for three of those five hundred years. This is a very hard Case, however the Compiler writes as if he fear'd no Colours, nor that any body would dare to take up the Pen against him.

But I must bring him to a better consideration of these things, and inform him that the Controversie betwixt him and me about Reliques is whether they were worshipped or no during the first five hundred years, and that I am so far from retiring within the Three first Centuries, that I challenged the Fourth and Fifth as well as the Three first as expressly rejecting and denying the worship of Reliques.

It is necessary for me to do this, since the Compiler confounding what I had said in relation to the Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries with what we do at present condemn the Church of Rome of, runs me down most grievously for a page or two, for daring to censure what was then done about the searching and treasuring up of Reliques, tho' I had shewn it to be expressly con-



trary to what was the *Practice* of the *three first Centuries*, for which I suppose I ought to have as *great veneration* at least, as for the *Practice* of the *Fourth and Fifth*. Ay, but says he, don't you see what men *he* dares to censure, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Jerom, S. Austin and Theodoret, and then grows very angry upon it, forgetting all the while that *he* is as pert against what the Church of Antioch did to S. Ignatius's body, the Church of Smyrna to S. Polycarp's; against what the Body of the Clergy of the Church of Rome did expressly enjoin in their Letter to the Clergy of Carthage; against what was done by all the Faithful of the first Ages towards the Bodies and Ashes of all the Martyrs; against what the Great Anchorite S. Anthony (as it is related in his Life, written by S. Athanasius) did so often beg of the Bishops, that they would forbid their people to keep the Bodies of their dead Friends unburied, censuring thereby the Custom of the Egyptians [and I may add, of all those Fathers mentioned by the Compiler against me] who before his time had begun what was so zealously practised and commended by those Fathers of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, and is so angrily contended for by the Compiler in his *Vindication*.

I will set down the whole passage, because it is so compleat a defence of all that I have written about these things, and is so full an Answer to all that the Compiler doth make so much noise about. S. Athanasius having related S. Anthony's farewell Oration to his Brother Monks, and their great desire to stay him with them, that so they might be honoured with his ending his days among them, tells us, that S. Anthony upon several reasons was utterly against it, but especially for that presumptuous custom of Egypt, which he thus describes.

For

For the Egyptians have a Custom among them of wrapping up indeed in linnen the Bodies of their Virtuous Men, and especially of the blessed Martyrs, and of giving them Funeral Rites, but they do not bury them in the Earth, but lay them upon Couches, and keep them in their Houses.

The VANITY of an inveterate Custom hath taught them, that this Honour is to be shewn to the Deceased. S. Anthony had often complained to the Bishops about this thing, and requested of them, that they would by Ecclesiastical Censure cure the People of this Evil Custom; and He himself was wont to chide both Men and Women very severely for it, telling them, that it was NOT LAWFUL, and that IT WAS NOT PLEASING TO GOD, and that the Sepulchres of the Patriarchs and Prophets, which continue to these days, did convince these actions to be unlawful; and he bid them to consider the Example of our

Lords own Body, which was buried in a Sepulchre, and sealed up with a Stone to the Third day on which he was to rise again. And by these means S. Anthony did reprehend and put a stop to this Evil Custom of Egypt towards the deceased, tho' it was to the Bodies which were Holy; -- and this just Reproof did root out of many this inbred Error, and they having buried the dead Bodies of their deceased Friends, returned the Lord thanks for the Good Admonition.

Our Compiler however is very earnest upon it, that what was practised in the latter end of the fourth and fifth Centuries towards the Reliques of the Saints and Martyrs is the very same, and no more than what is now practised.

\* Mos etenim Egyptiis est, nobilium & præcipue beatorum Martyrum Corpora linteamine quidem obvolvere, & studium funeri-solicum non negare: terrâ verò non abscondere, sed super lectulos domi posita reservare. Hunc honorem quiescentibus reddi, inveteratæ con-uetudinis VANITAS tradidit. De hoc Antonius sæpe & Episcopos deprecatus est, ut populos Ecclesiastica consuetudine corrigerent, & laicos viros ac mulieres rigidius ipse convenit, dicens: Nec LICITUM HOC ESSE, nec DEO PLACITUM, quippe cum Patriarcharum & Prophetarum Sepulchra, quæ ad nos usq; perdurant hæc facta convincerent: Dominici quoq; Corporis exemplum oportere intueri iubebat, quod in Sepulchro positum lapide usq; ad resurrectionis tertium diem clausum fuerit. Atq; his modis vitium circa defunctos Ægypti, etiam si Sancta essent Corpora, coarguebat. -- Hæc iusta persuasio multorum insitum evellit errorem, & repositis in terra cadaveribus domino gratias pro bono Magisterio retulerunt. D. Athanasii Vita S. Antonii Tom. 2. p. 482. Edit. Commelin. 1600.

practised towards them by the Order of the Church of Rome; and he builds this whole fancy upon the equivocalness of some words and actions used then as well as now; but that I may ruine this groundless pretence, and all his Jingling about words, I will settle and prove these two things:

First, That the Church of Rome doth command and practise the worship of Reliques.

Secondly, That for the First Five Centuries of the Church the Worship of Reliques was neither commanded nor practised by the Primitive Church.

For the proof of the First, I need only insist on what the Council of Trent in her twenty-fifth and last Session did decree about Reliques, that the Bodies and Reliques of the Saints were to be worshipped, and a little after she denounces an Anathema against all that should affirm, that Veneration and Honour are not to be paid to Reliques. That by Veneration and Honour in this Decree Religious Worship is meant, may be cleared from the best Writers of the Church of Rome, who use the words Veneration and Adoration promiscuously, and in the same sense.

Vasques in Par.  
3. D. Thom.  
Disp. 112.

Thus Vasques the great Schoolman, since that Council, in his Disputations upon S. Thomas, having proposed this question, whether the Bodies and Reliques of the Saints are to be VENERATED; answers, that it is an indisputable Truth among the Catholicks, that the RELIQUES of SAINTS, whether they be any parts of them, as Bones, Flesh and Asbes, or any other things that have touch'd them, or did belong to them, ought to be ADORED and honoured with Sacred or DIVINE HONOUR: and a little after concluding, that he had proved, that RELIQUES are to be ADORED, he next sets upon explaining with what kind of Worship and Honour THE RELIQUES ought to be VENERATED.

And

And S. Thomas himself before Vasques had thus *promiscuously* used the Words VENERATION and ADORATION, and whereas Vasques had put the *Question* whether Reliques were to be VENERATED, S. Thomas puts it, whether RELIQUES are to be ADORED, and as Vasques had answered that they were to be ADORED, so S. Thomas answers his *Question*, that seeing we VENERATE the Saints of God, we must also VENERATE their Bodies and RELIQUES. And he does throughout that Article in his *Objections* and *Answers* sometimes use the one, and sometimes the other, but more frequently the Word ADORATION to express what Honour the Church did think due to RELIQUES.

S. Thom. Summa, Pars 3. Quest. 25. Artic. 6. p. 65.

I was more careful to make use of the *Authority* of S. Thomas herein, because he is lookt upon to be of such Sacred Authority in the Church of Rome, that Sabran the Jesuit assures me that above one half of the Divines of the Christian World [and those I am sure are at least all the Divines that are in the Church of Rome] do own Him for Master, and bind themselves to maintain ALL He hath taught. Well then, If the Case be as the Jesuit represents it, I am certain to carry my Cause that the Church of Rome doth ADORE the RELIQUES of the Saints, since I am sure that S. Thomas taught that RELIQUES ARE TO BE ADORED.

Reply to my I. Letter to him.

But without the *Authority* of S. Thomas, from whose Decision, the Jesuit told me in his Letter to the Peer, that he would not swerve, tho' I had proved S. Thomas altogether and certainly mistaken about that thing: I think me may prove that by VENERATION the Council of Trent did mean the ADORATION of RELIQUES, if they will but permit us to explain the meaning of the Decrees of that Council by the standing Reformed Offices in their Church.

In



Missale Rom.  
Feria 6. in Pa-  
rasceue. fol. 83.  
84. Edit. Paris.  
in 8°. 1582.

In the *Twenty fifth Session* of that Council, in their Decree about *Images*, they do use the *very same Words* to express what Honour they will have done to *Images*, that they had used immediately before for the *Reliques* of the *Saints*. VENERATION and HONOUR are the Words employed in both the *Paragraphs*. Now to find what that VENERATION means, which the Council of Trent appoints to be paid to the *Images*, we need only look into their *Good-Friday-SERVICE*, and into their *Pontifical* to find their Church's Sense. In the *Good-Friday-SERVICE* we meet with the Word ADORATION, and ADORED, about the Honour paid to the Image of the Cross above Ten times; and that we cannot mistake them, the Worship or VENERATION of the Cross is three times plainly styled the ADORATION OF THE CROSS. In their *Pontifical*, to shew what they mean by VENERATION and HONOUR in the Decree of the Council, it is given as the Reason why the CROSS carried before a Legate should take the right Hand of the Emperour's Sword (at the Reception of an Emperour with Procession into any City) because, LATRIA, a DIVINE WORSHIP IS DUE TO THE CROSS.

This I question not will be able to convince all Men that VENERATION and ADORATION are promiscuously used for the same thing, and that by appointing a VENERATION to be paid to the RELIQUES of the Saints, the Council of Trent did command that THE RELIQUES of Saints should be ADORED; and this is sufficient for what I undertook to prove, That the Church of Rome doth command the Worship of Reliques.

That she doth practise the Worshipping of Reliques is what I have next to shew; but this may be dispatch'd in a few Words, since every body knows that their People in the Church of Rome are not behind hand in practising



sing what *their Church* commands about *Reliques*: and I suppose that *this* will be granted me, That what the *Church* commands, the *People* may very lawfully do; and that *they* do practise in all their *Popish Countries* the *Adoration of Reliques*.

I must then prove my Second Particular, *That for the First five Centuries of the Church, the Worship of Reliques was neither commanded nor practised by the Primitive Church.*

To prove that the *Worship of Reliques* was not commanded during *that time*, we need only to appeal to the *Canons and Laws of the Four General Councils* held within the *Fourth and Fifth Century*, wherein *not a Syllable* is to be met with about *any such thing*: and *they* of the *Church of Rome* are as well satisfied as *we*, that there is nothing in *those Councils* for their purpose about *Reliques*, and therefore do not pretend to shew *any Command* for the *Worship of Images* from *any of those Councils*.

And that the *Primitive Church* did not practise *any Worship of Reliques* during *that time*, is as easie to shew from the *Generality of the Fathers*, who were utterly against *Worshipping the Saints themselves*, and consequently much more against the *Worshipping any of the Mortal Remains of those Saints*. I will only insist upon *two*, who lived in the *beginning of the Fifth Century of the Church*, *S. Austin* to prove that *they* did not then worship the *Saints themselves*, and *S. Hierom* to shew that *they* did not worship the *Saints Reliques*.

*S. Austin* in answer to *Faustus the Manichee* who had objected to the *Orthodox their Worshipping the Saints*, shews him the *Falseness and Silliness of his Accusation*, by telling him, that the *Church did indeed worship the Martyrs*, but that it was merely *such civil Worship as is paid to Holy Men while they are alive*; and that I am sure

Colimus ergo  
Martyres eo  
cultu dilectio-  
nis & societa-  
tis, quo & in  
hac vita colun-  
tur sancti ho-  
mines Dei. Aug.  
c. Faust. l. 20.  
c. 21.

N

was

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

was never hitherto accused of being *Religious Worship*.

And for the *Reliques* of the *Saints*, when *Vigilantius* had objected to *several* in the *Church* (as *S. Hierom* represents it) a *Worship* of *Reliques*: *S. Hierom* with his usual vehemence falls upon him, and asks him first, who ever adored the *Martyrs*? [A Question that can very easily be answered in our days without the danger of being called *Madmen* for our pains, as *Vigilantius* was for even thinking that any of the *Church* should be so foolish as to worship the *Martyrs*] and then he tells him that They did not WORSHIP the *Saints* RELIQUES, and were so far from it, that they did not Worship or Adore even the

<sup>f</sup> Nos autem NON dico Martyrum RELIQUIAS, sed ne Solem quidem — non Angelos, non Archangelos — COLIMUS & ADORAMUS. D. Hieron. advers. Vigilant. ad Riparium.

*Sun* it self <sup>e</sup>, nay not the *Angels*, nor the *Archangels*. Here we see *S. Hierom* confuting the *Accusation* of *Worshipping* of *Reliques*, by shewing that the *Church* did not worship the *Sun* it self,

nor the *Angels* or *Archangels* themselves, which are *Creatures* so much above, and more *Glorious* than the dead *Remains* of any *Saint*, and therefore must needs be much further from the giving *WORSHIP* to the *Saints* *Reliques*.

Having thus proved these two things, that the *Church* of *Rome* doth worship *Reliques*, and that the *Primitive Church* did not, we ought to conclude as to this Point about *Reliques*, that the *Primitive Fathers* were no *Papists*, but *Protestants*, since they did declare against the *Worship* of *Reliques* as much as the *Church* of *England* doth, and did detest the *Worshipping* of them as much as we can.

There is one Great Mistake that the *Compiler* must be rectified in, before I leave this Chapter about *Reliques*, and that is from the *Community* of *Actions* and *Expressions* to gather that the same thing was done by some of the *Fathers*.

*Fathers* towards the *Reliques*, that is done *now* in the *Church of Rome*: He cannot be ignorant that most of the *External Expressions* of *Respect* are common to *Civil* and *Religious Worship*, and yet that *no Body* is so wild as to conclude from thence that *Civil* and *Religious Worship* are the *same thing*.

When *Abraham* bowed himself to the ground before the *Children of Heth*, he used the *very same Gesture* that he was wont to make use of in *his Worship* of *God*, and yet I hope our *Compiler* would not have it concluded from the *same Gesture* used upon *both those* Occasions, either that *Abraham*, when he bowed to the *Children of Heth*, paid *Religious Worship* unto *them*, or that *he*, using the *same Gesture* in the *Service* of *God*, paid only a *Civil Worship* unto *Him*. And yet *This* is all that he builds upon, when *he* is so earnest about the *thing*, and would confound *Civil* and *Religious Worship*, by shewing what *no Body* denies, that *several* of the *Outward Expressions* of *Civil* and *Religious Worship* are the *same*. Whereas, notwithstanding the *Outward Gestures* be the *same*, we do easily know *Religious* from *Civil Worship*, by the *Object* to whom it is paid, and by the *Professions* of them *who pay it*.

And by this we are able to decide and resolve that *Scruple* which the *Compiler* would fain raise about the *Matter* of *Reliques*. The *Primitive Fathers* did declare that *they* were against giving *any Religious Worship* to *Reliques*, and therefore when *we* meet with any extraordinary *Expressions* or *Actions* among *them* which might otherwise appear to be *Religious*, we are obliged to look upon *them* only as *Expressions* of *Civil Worship* by reason of the *Declaration* so often made by *them*, that *they* did *not worship Reliques*. But for the *same Gestures* or *Actions* used by the *Church of Rome* towards the *Reliques* or *Bodies* of the *Saints*, we are obliged upon the *very*

The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

same Reason to look upon *them* as Expressions of a Religious Worship or Adoration, since *She* hath prevented our taking *them* in the other Sense, by declaring and decreeing in her Council of Trent that the BODIES and RELIQUES of the SAINTS are to be WORSHIPPED or ADOR-  
RED.

And further to let him see *this* by an Instance used by *Himself*, He urges that they used to *touch* and *kiss* the Reliques of the Martyrs, and shews it from Gregory Nys-  
sen, which was the highest Expression of Respect used then towards Reliques: Now how far this is from being Religious Worship, in *them*, or the same Kiss from being but Civil Worship in the Church of Rome, I have already abundantly cleared, from the Professions made about Reliques by the Primitive Fathers, and by the Church of Rome in her Council of Trent.

I have insisted the longer upon *this* Business about the Reliques, because the Compiler himself did; and have taken the more care to clear the whole Matter about the Worship of Reliques, because He took so much pains to disguise and obscure it, and by confounding Civil and Religious Worship, to bear the credulous Reader in hand that the Church of Rome and the Primitive Church are exactly the same in their Respect to Reliques: and that the Church of Rome doth no more pay a Religious Worship or Adoration to Reliques, than the Primitive Fathers did: the Vanity and Falshood of *all* which I have fully display'd, that so the Compiler being driven out of *this* Hold, and being made ashamed of such groundless Delusions and Distinctions, may e'en fall into the Old Track of defending Popery, and speak out fairly the Sense of *their* Church about the Worship of Reliques, and defend with the Angelical Doctor S. Thomas Aquinas, and his Disciples, (who, Sabran the Jesuit tells us, are above One half of the Divines of the Christian World) that

that THE RELIQUES of the SAINTS OUGHT TO BE ADORED.

He next undertakes the business of *Purgatory*, and finding that I had invincibly shewn, that the *Primitive Fathers*, notwithstanding their *Prayers* for the Faithful deceased, did believe, that they were at the same time in a state of *Bliss*, of *Comfort*, of *Peace*, of *Joy*, and *Light* and *Tranquillity*, nay in *Heaven it self*; every one of which is utterly inconsistent with the Condition of *Purgatory* believed and taught by the *Church of Rome*; He hopes to salve all, by granting what he could not deny of the *Primitive Fathers* believing the Faithful deceased to be in such a Condition, and reconciling all this to the Belief of *Purgatory* in his *Church*.

To this purpose he tells us, *that the supposing those Souls, for which the Fathers pray'd, to be in a State of Joy and Comfort, does most nearly agree with the present Practice and Doctrine of the Church of Rome.* I am glad to hear this, and now I perceive there is none of those torments and burnings in the Case, with which the people used to be frighted out of their Wits themselves, and to scare one another: but the unhappiness is, this is too good news to be true; and I doubt we shall find by and by that the *Romish Purgatory* is the very same place that it used to be thought, and that it is just as hot, and as tormenting and intolerable at this very day as it was six hundred years ago, when those lamentable shrieks were so often heard from the poor Souls in *Purgatory*: However since I suppose our *Compiler* knows himself not to have been so careful of his Life as to imagine he shall escape calling at *Purgatory*, I cannot discommend his making *Purgatory* as easy as he can, and his representing it to be just such a place as he would with all his heart find it, when he comes thither.

He endeavours to prove *this agreement from that Prayer*



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Prayer in the Canon of the Mass used in their Church, wherein they pray God to grant to those his faithful Servants who rest in the sleep of Peace, a Place of Comfort, Light and Peace. In answer to which I will only tell him here, that this Old-Prayer in the Canon of the Mass is directly against the present Church of Rome in the business of Purgatory, and against what the Compiler hath positively asserted a little after this about Prayer not being made for those in Bliss, or those in Hell, but only for those who could be relieved by the Prayers of the Living; as I shall by and by shew. In the mean time I will consider what he further offers to prove this Agreement; and this is no other than to tell us over again, that the State of Purgatory is agreeable to that Prayer, and then to describe it, by telling us very gravely, that in Purgatory there is a kind of Rest and Quiet, where the Interior Powers of the Souls are well order'd and compos'd; the Understanding settled in the Light of Faith, the Will inflam'd with the Love of God, the Imagination undisturb'd, and secure Hopes of once enjoying God, filling the Souls with a happy Resignation and Comfort.*

And is not this very Comical stuff? Certainly, all that read it will wonder whence this Man comes to have so very nice and exact an account of the *State of Purgatory*, as to know how every one of the Faculties of our Soul are employ'd there. One would think he had been there already himself, or that somebody hath slipt out thence, and instead of going streight to Heaven had come to Earth again, to inform the *Compiler* how things stand there, and how every one is employ'd there; which brings into my mind that *Dialogue of Lucian*, which gives us just such another account of the *State of the Dead*: I must confess I cannot read such things without an Indignation to see grave men Romancing about things so serious; and tho' I can bear well enough

Sir

Sir Thomas Moor's Accounts what people do, and how they are taken up in his *Utopia*, yet I cannot forgive any Christian that will bring such Comical Accounts into our Religion: and for any Man to write at the rate the *Compiler* does here, and to give such a formal account of things for which he can have no grounds, nor reasons, nor any probability or possibility (without a divine Revelation) of knowing any of the things he so confidently affirms, is to make another *Utopia*, and to ridicule the *Christian Religion* to the World.

I cannot find that the *Compiler* makes the nature of their *Purgatory* to be any thing else than the *Longing desire of those in it of seeing and enjoying God*, which *longing desire* doth give them a *most afflicting Anguish*; from which they are capable of being delivered and reliev'd by the *Prayers of their Friends on Earth*. And he concludes, that this is all that is required in our *Profession of Faith*, in which 'tis said, I hold that there is a *Purgatory*, and that the *Souls there detain'd, are reliev'd by the Suffrages of the Faithful*.

I know the *Compiler* too well to trust him in these things, wherein he hath taken a great deal of pains to no purpose in the World, since it is very easy to demonstrate, that He and F. *Alexandre*, with the other *Expositors* of the *New Popery* have quite run away from the true old doctrine of their Church about *Purgatory*; that the true *Purgatory* of the Church of Rome is as inconsistent with that State of *Light, Tranquillity and Comfort*, wherein the *Primitive Fathers* supposed the *Faithful* to be, as *Light* is with *Darkness*, *Torment* with *Ease*, and the most exquisite Pain with *Pleasure*.

And this is what I will now prove, that the *Romish Purgatory* is a place of *Torment*, wherein the *Souls* of those who are in it, undergo the same pains that the *damned* do, and that there is no other difference be-

twixt *Hell-Fire* and *Purgatory-Fire*, but that the one is Eternal, and the other but Temporal: and this I am sure will discover the absurdity of all that our *Compiler* hath said here in his *Vindication*, and ruin the pretended agreement betwixt the *Primitive Fathers State of Joy and Tranquillity*, and the *Purgatory* of the *Church of Rome*.

¶ Concil. Trident. Sessio 25.  
de Purgatorio.

The *Council of Trent* was so shy, or rather so cunning, about the business of *Purgatory*, that she only decrees in general terms, *That there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls detain'd there do receive Relief by the Prayers of the Faithful, but especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Mass*; without telling us one word further of the State, Nature, Condition or Place of this *Purgatory*, or any other Circumstances that might explain the Nature of it to them, who, notwithstanding these general ambiguous words, are bound to believe it as much as the *Article of the Trinity*: So that either there is no way of knowing what this *Purgatory* is, or we must gather the knowledge of the nature and condition of it from the best approved *Writers* or general sense of their *Church* about it.

I could not but smile, I must confess, to find the *Compiler* to be so very shy in his *Vindication*, and to be so afraid of having any body believe that there is any thing of *Fire* in the Case when he is describing the nature of *Purgatory*, since tho' he had forgotten it, yet I had not, how in his *Nubes Testium* he makes the greatest show for *Purgatory* with his *PURGING FIRE* out of *Gregory Nyssen*, with his *PURGATORY FIRE* out of *S. Basil*, and with his *Baptism of FIRE after Death*, out of *Gregory Nazianzen*; but now in his *Vindication*, He hath put all the *Three Fires* out, and all this because tho' they did agree well enough with *Places of Light*, yet there were no ways possible of making 'em *Places of Comfort* and

and Joy; and therefore they deserv'd to be put quite out.

Of all the *Writers* I ever met with, I never observed any that would plunge himself so grievously as this poor *Compiler* will; tho' he set himself never so warmly to prove any thing, nay to be as earnest for it as if the whole of Christianity did depend upon it; yet if afterwards he finds that the matter is or may be turn'd upon him, then farewell this or that Opinion, and all the quotations for it into the bargain; he wipes his Mouth, gets into another Box, and then talks or writes as if he had never affirmed, nay not heard of any such thing.

Well then, since the *Compiler* is for throwing away all his quotations out of the *Fathers* to prove *Purgatory* was a FIRE, I cannot make use of them, since he has put them all out: but must inquire among other people to see what they make the *Nature of Purgatory* to be. There is none so able or so probable to help me herein as *Bellarmino*; One of the greatest Men their *Church* ever had. The *Cardinal* in his second Book about *Purgatory*, examining the *Nature of Purgatory*, concludes thus, *It is certain, that in Purgatory as well as in Hell, there is a Punishment<sup>b</sup> of FIRE. Whether this Fire be taken properly, or Metaphorically, and whether it signify the Pain of sense, or of loss, as some will have it.* This he did gather, as he tells us immediately after in the same Chapter, from the Testimonies of the *Fathers*: for ALL of them (says He) did call the Punishment of *Purgatory* FIRE.

Here we find *Bellarmino* determining that *Purgatory-Fire*, and *Hell-Fire*, are the very same by *Nature*: and the Title of his next Chapter is *Ignem Purgatorii esse Corporeum*,

<sup>b</sup> Certum est 4<sup>o</sup>, in Purgatorio, sicut etiam in Inferno esse poenam Ignis, sive iste Ignis accipiat propriè, sive Metaphoricè, & sive significet poenam sensus, sive damni, ut quidam volunt — ex Patrum Testimoniis. Omnes enim IGNEM appellabant Purgatorii poenam. *Bellarmino de Purgatorio, l. 2. c. 10.*



Idem ibid. l. 2.  
c. 11.

po<sup>reum</sup>, that the FIRE of Purgatory is CORPOREAL, for the proof of which, He urges, that it is *Communis sententia Theologorum*, the Common Opinion of their Divines, that Purgatory-Fire is True and Real Fire, and of the same kind with our Elementary Fire.

I have chosen thus to give Bellarmine's words in this Controversy, because he does not urge his own sense or Thoughts only about the Nature of Purgatory, but insists upon it, and tells us, that it is the COMMON JUDGMENT of their DIVINES, that Purgatory-Fire is true real Elementary Fire: as before he had deliver'd as a thing CERTAIN, that Purgatory-Fire and Hell-Fire are the same in kind.

But I need not content my self with Bellarmine and the Common Consent of the Divines of the Church of Rome to prove that the Romish Purgatory is a Place of Torments by Fire: I have better evidence for it, and such as our Compiler, nor any of the New Expositors of Popery dare not refuse, if they will allow One of their General Councils to be of as much Authority among them as another. In the Account we have of the General Council of Florence, we find the Latins continually contending for a Purgatory-Fire.

Thus in the History of what did immediately precede the First Session of this Council at Ferrara (from whence, by reason of the Plague, it was removed to Florence) we find a select number of twelve Latins and twelve Greeks, appointed to meet, and debate of the chief points in Controversy betwixt the Greek and Roman Church. The point about Purgatory was the first debated, where the Latins at first word told their Churches sense, that by Purgatory they meant a Purging FIRE, and throughout the whole debate we find them still using the term Purgatory-Fire for to express their Churches sense about the Nature of Purgatory: the Greeks are perfectly against there



there being any such thing as a *Purgatory-Fire*; and their *Opinions* are distinctly set down in the *Preliminary Acts* of that *Council*, which I will transcribe hither for to shew, not only that the *Romans* did believe *Purgatory* to be *Fire*, but also to let the *World* see, that the *Compiler*, tho' he was for the *Church of Rome* in his *Nubes Testium*, is since run over (in his *Vindication*) to the *Opinion* of the *Greeks* about *Purgatory*.

The sense of the *Latin Church* is thus delivered, *The Italians* do acknowledge a *Fire* even during this present *World*, and a *Purging* by *Fire*; They own also a *FIRE* in the *World* to come, but not a *Purgatory Fire*, but an *Eternal One*: and that during this *World* the *Souls* are purged by *FIRE*, and delivered thence [sooner or later] according to every ones *Sins*, so that He which hath committed many *Sins* is not delivered thence till after he hath been a long time purged; but he that was guilty of but few *sins*, was the sooner absolved, the *Church* also (as hath already been said) helping them; and [lastly] that all are *PURGED* by *FIRE*. Wherefore the *Italians* do take this *FIRE* to be *TEMPORARY* during this present *World*, but *ETERNAL* in the *World* to come, and THIS *TEMPORARY FIRE* they name *PURGATORY*.

After this the sense of the *Greeks* about it is immediately set down in these very Words: But the *Greeks* think that there is *NO FIRE* but in the *World* to come, [tho' they do own] a temporary *Punishment* of *Souls* [which they make to consist herein] that the *Souls* of *Sinners* go into a *Dark Place*, into a *Place* of *Grief*, where they are grieved for a time, and punished with the want of *Divine Light* [or as our *Compiler* hath expressed it, of seeing and enjoying *God*] but by the *Prayers* and *Sacrifices*

<sup>h</sup> Οἱ δ' Ἴταλοι καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι Πῦρ ὁμολογεῖσι, καὶ καθαρῶν διὰ Πυρὸς, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι Πῦρ ὁμολογεῖσι καὶ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλ' αἰώνιον, &c. Concil. Florent. p. 28. Edit. Cossart.

## The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

of the Priests, and by Alms they are purged, that is, they are delivered out of that obscure Place and Affliction, and are dismiss'd thence, but not in the least purged by FIRE, for the Greeks do not own any Operation of Fire here with the Italians, but meerly that Prayer, Intercession; and Alms do operate and obtain that Deliverance.

After the setting down of both the *Latins* and *Greeks* Opinions in this manner, I will end this with the Conclusion that was placed there in the *Acts* of that Council immediately after them. This then is the Difference betwixt them; the *Greeks* say there is a Punishment and Affliction, and a Place for this Punishment, but that it is

NOT BY FIRE: but the *Italians* [on the other hand] say<sup>1</sup>, that this Punishment and Purgation is BY FIRE.  
 ἡ Ἐκκλησία τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡ ἀποστολική· Ὅτι μὴ Γεαικὶ κέλευσιν καὶ λύπην καὶ τόπον κολάσεως λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ διὰ Πυρός· Ὅτι δὲ Ἱταλοὶ κέλευσιν καὶ καθαρισμὸν διὰ Πυρός.  
 Concil. Florent. p. 28.

This Account of the Sence of the *Roman Church* is so plain for a *Purgatory Fire*, which differs only from *Hell Fire* in that the one is *Temporary* and during this *World*, but the other *Eternal* in the *World to come*; that it would be very vain to offer at any thing for the further clearing of it here: I must only not forget to take notice of the Confidence of the *Compiler*, who will very magisterially have the *Greeks* and the *Latins* to differ chiefly herein about a Name; and is angry at me for saying the *Greeks* disown any such Place as *Purgatory*: whereas it is as plain as the Sun, that the *Greeks* do disown *Purgatory*, as it signifies a Place of Torment, wherein Souls are purged by Fire, which he cannot but know was the Sence in which I used the word, and the whole Church of *Rome* too, excepting a few *Expositors* and *Representers*, who since they cannot defend the *Doctrines* and *Practices* of their Church, are running away quite from them, and setting up a  
 New

New Popery, which they think they can defend.

The Passages I have produced out of the *Council of Florence* it self do unanswerably shew what the *Latins* do mean by *Purgatory*; and we find after all the Debates and Conteſts in the *Council* that the *Pope Eugenius* insisted mostly upon having it granted that *those faithful who dyed in the state of the Penitents, do GO into a PURGATORY FIRE, and after having been PURGED* <sup>k</sup> *Concil. Flor. Sessio 25. p. 494* *there, are removed to the Society of them* <sup>k</sup> *who enjoy the Vision of God.*

Another Authority I am able to produce, which if it be not equal, yet is next to that of a *General Council*, from the *Catechism ad Parochos*, drawn up by the Order of the *Council of Trent*.

Tho the *Council* it self was so sly about the business of *Purgatory*, yet the Persons who drew up the *Catechism* did see it necessary to speak out more plainly the Sense of their *Church* about the Nature of *Purgatory*; and therefore upon the *Fifth Article* in the *Apostles Creed* about the *Descent into Hell*, when they come to give the various Senses in which the word *Hell* is used, they tell us it is first taken for the *Receptacle of the Damned, wherein the Souls of them are tormented with an Eternal and Unquenchable Fire.* They next will have it to signify *Purgatory*, and these are their own Words. Furthermore there is a *PURGATORY FIRE, in which the Souls of the Pious are* \* *TORMENTED FOR*

A SET TIME, in order to their being expiated, that so an Entrance into their Eternal Country may be open unto them, into which nothing polluted does enter. And to let the World see they did not give their own Sense herein, but

that of their Church, they quote in the Margin the *Council of Trent* it self for it, in the 25<sup>th</sup> Session about

*Purgatory:*

\* Præterea est PURGATORIUS IGNIS, in quo Piorum Animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut iis in æternam Patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur. *Catechism. ad Parochos, Pars 1. p. 50. Edit. Lugd. 1676.*

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Purgatory*: and tell us immediately after, *that Holy Councils* [by which they must mean] *that of Florence* as well as *that of Trent*] *have declared for the Truth of this Doctrine, that it is confirmed by the Testimonies of Scripture, and Apostolical Tradition: and therefore the Parish Priest is to treat more diligently, and more frequently of Purgatory, because we (say the Authors of the Catechism) are fallen into those times, wherein Men do not endure SOUND DOCTRINE.*

If the Times were thought so bad, when that *Catechism* was drawn up, what must be thought of *ours*, when not only the *Protestants* will not endure this *SOUND DOCTRINE*, but the *Present Writers* of the *Church of Rome*, the *Bishop of Meaux*, his *Vindicator*, and the *Compiler* will no more endure this *SOUND DOCTRINE* of a *PURGATORY FIRE* than the *Hereticks*, but cry out so often that the *Church doth not believe*, that the *Church doth not teach a Purgatory FIRE*. Whereas it is as evident as that there is Day and Night, that *this Catechism* drawn up by the *Order of the Council of Trent*, and confirmed by *Pope Pius the Fifth*, doth not only here deliver it as *Sound Doctrine*, that there is a *PURGATORY FIRE* WHEREIN THE SOULS of the *FAITHFUL* are *TORMENTED FOR A SET TIME*, but in the next Page, speaking of the *Souls of the Faithful which departed this Life before Christ's Resurrection*, says, that they went not to *Heaven*, which was not opened to any before *Christ's Death and Resurrection*, but that they were carried either into *Abraham's Bosom*, (or as it now happens to those, who have something to discharge when they dye) were expiated or purged by the *FIRE OF PURGATORY*.

But I have a better evidence than all these to prove, that by *Purgatory* the *Church of Rome* doth certainly mean a *Place of Torment*, wherein those *Souls* that are detain'd

detain'd in it undergo *Fiery-Torments* which differ no otherwise from *Hell-Torments*, but only in the *Duration* of them, that *Purgatory Torments* are but for a time, but the other are everlasting: and it is no other than the *Office for the Dead* in the *Romish Missal*.

In the *Mass* for the *Dead* the *Offertory* runs thus,  
**O Lord Jesu Christ, King of Glory! DELIVER**  
**the SOULS of all the FAITHFUL DECEASED**  
**from the PAINS OF HELL, and from the BOT-**  
**TOMLESS PIT: Deliber them**  
**from the MOUTH of the LION,**  
**that HELL may not SWALLOW**  
**THEM UP FOR EVER, and that**  
**they may not fall into outer Dark-**  
**ness; but let thy Holy Angel Michael**  
**convey them unto that Heavenly**  
**Light, which thou hast promised of**  
**old to Abraham and to his Seed.**

<sup>1</sup> Domine Jesu Christe, Rex Gloriz,  
 libera animas omnium fidelium defun-  
 ctorum de Pœnis Inferni, & de pro-  
 fundo lacu: libera eas de Ore Leonis,  
 ne absorbeat eas Tartarus, ne cadant  
 in Obscurum: sed signifer Sanctus  
 Michael repræsentet eas in Lucem San-  
 ctam: quam olim Abraham promissisti,  
 & semini ejus. *Missæ pro Defunctis in*  
*Missali Romano*, fol. 51. Edit. Paris.  
 in 8°. 1582.

*This is the service of the Church of Rome at this very day for the Dead, the only enquiry now to be made is, who these are for whom the Church of Rome is so solici-  
 tous to have them delivered out of the Pains of Hell, and out of the Mouth of the Lion, &c. And who can I better inquire of than our Compiler himself? He shall be the Man, that the World may see how very fairly I deal with my Adversaries. This Prayer then must be put up for one of these three sorts of men, either for the Souls who are in Heaven, or for the Souls who are in Hell, or for some Souls who are neither in Heaven, nor Hell, but in a middle State or Place which their Church doth call Purgatory.*

*Is this Prayer therefore used for the Souls in Heaven? No, says our Compiler, for it is needless to pray for those that are in Heaven; there being no want there at all, no want of Relief, of Refreshment [and consequently no Hell-*  
 Torments:



Torments undergone by any Souls there] of Pardon; there being no Guilt there of Sins. Is it for the Souls in Hell? No, replies the Compiler again, it is as fruitless to pray for those in Hell, that State being wholly irreversible: So that by his help we have light upon the Souls that are prayed for there, and those are the Souls in Purgatory, which according to this Prayer, undergo their Hell-Torments, and are in a Condition nothing different from the damned but meerly in the Duration of their Pains, these Souls torments being but temporary, but those of the damned eternal. And for the Condition of the Place in which these miserable Souls are, we find it here represented in this Prayer as the same with Hell, and we meet in this short Prayer with all the Terms by which Hell is described to us in the word of God; so that there is no danger of our mistaking the sense of the Church of Rome about Purgatory, since we find it so plainly set forth in her Office for the Souls in it, as a Place of Fiery Torments.

However to put this thing without the possibility of a Reply; that the Compiler may see that it is not I alone who gather thus much out of that Prayer, I will give the Reader an account of Cardinal Capisucchi's Opinion in his 5<sup>th</sup> Controversy about the Words of this very Prayer which I have made use of, and put down above.

The Cardinal first puts down the Opinion of them who look upon that Prayer as offer'd up for those that are in Hell, who may come to be deliver'd thence as Trajan the Heathen Emperour is said to have been: but This he refuses as most false and erroneous upon the reasons commonly given in this Case. He next puts down their Opinion that will have it to relate to those who are just a dying and drawing on: but this Opinion he says is generally rejected, not only because those that are only drawing on cannot be, with any propriety of Speech, called the Souls  
of

of the Dead, but because the Custom of the Church is to use this Prayer for those Souls which have many years ago left the Body. After which He concludes, that this Prayer is used for those that are in Purgatory, and gives us this Exposition of the Words of the Prayer, **Deliver, O Lord, the Souls of all the Faithful Deceased from the Pains of Hell, that is, from PURGATORY-FIRE, WHICH IS HELD TO BE ALTOGETHER THE SAME WITH HELL-FIRE, and from the Bottomless-Pit, and from the Mouth of the Lion, that is, from the Prison hid under <sup>m</sup> the Earth, wherein the Souls of the Faithful are detain'd to be purged; that HELL may not swallow them up for Ever: that is, that the Receptacles and Bands of that deep Prison may not stay them further or any longer: nor the PAINS OF HELL, as the Jaws of some fierce, cruel and savage Beast detain them: Whereupon the Church doth call PURGATORY-FIRE Hell, because Purgatory-Fire and Hell-Fire is the same; that they may not fall into outer darkness; that is, that this Obscure Place may no longer detain the Souls which it receives falling into it.**

<sup>m</sup> Juxta hæc singula illius Orationis verba exponi possunt, nam dicitur, Domine, libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum de penis Inferni; id est, à PURGATORIO IGNE, qui IDEM prorsus esse perhibetur, atq; IGNIS INFERNI, Et de profundo lacu, de Ore Leonis; à Carcere nimirum sub Terram abdito, ubi detentæ expurgantur animæ picurum. Ne absorbeat eas Tartarus: hoc est ne amplius & diutius eas profundi illius Carceris Cavernæ & vincula remorentur, nec Inferni poenæ tanquam fauces quardam bellæ immanis, sævæ & truculentæ detineant; Unde IGNEM PURGATORIUM, cum sit IDEM qui IGNIS INFERNI, appellat Ecclesia Tartarum. Ne cadant in Obscurum; id est, ne obscurum, quas cadentes exceperit, longius detineat. Fr. Raimund Capisucchi Controversiæ Theolog. selectæ. Controversia 5<sup>a</sup> p. 237. Edit. Romæ 1677.

Here is the Interpretation of a Great Cardinal of the Church of Rome now alive, and which is more, the Chief Licenser of all Divinity Books at Rome, as **Walter of the Sacred Palace**; one of the qualifications for which place certainly is to understand the Faith and Doctrines of the Church of Rome. Here we meet with him explaining that Prayer in the Mass for the Dead, as rela-

P

ting

ting to *Purgatory*, and calling it over and over again a place of *Torment*, *Purgatory-Fire*, and declaring it to be the same with *Hell-Fire*.

I took the pains to peruse and transcribe that large passage about the *Exposition* of this *Prayer* hither, because I could not call it to mind without a secret Indignation, that this *Cardinal Capisucchi*, but two years before the Printing of this Book (which was not then first written, but Reprinted) was one of those who Licensed and so much commended the *Bishop of Condom's Exposition*, in which we find an account of *Purgatory* perfectly inconsistent with what the *Cardinal* had written in his *Controversies*.

In the *Bishop of Condom's Exposition*, we find these expressions about *Purgatory*. This is what the Council of Trent proposes to our Belief, touching the Souls detained in *Purgatory*, without determining<sup>a</sup> in WHAT THEIR PAINS consists, or many other such like things; concerning which this holy Council demands great moderation, blaming those who divulge what is uncertain or suspected. Such is the innocent, and holy DOCTRINE of the CATHOLICK CHURCH touching *Satisfactions*.

<sup>a</sup> Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, By the Bishop of Condom, p. 15.

But for all *Cardinal Capisucchi's* Licensing and approving this passage in that *Exposition*, He himself had written the direct contrary, when he makes the Pains of *Purgatory* to be by *Fire*, and makes *Hell-Fire* and *Purgatory-Fire* to be the SAME; and not only knew this to be, but published that it was the Faith of their Church that does in that *Prayer* for the Dead call *Purgatory Hell*, because *Purgatory-Fire* and *Hell-Fire* were the very same.

All the defence that can be made for *Cardinal Capisucchi*, must be, that the *Bishop of Condom's* words were restrained to the Council of Trent, which Council it is certain did not determine any thing about what the

the Purgatory pains consisted in; but this can by no means excuse him, since it is false that the Bishop of Condom's words are confin'd to that Council, for he just after the mention of the Council says, that what he had set down there about *Satisfactions* [in this World, or in Purgatory] was the *innocent and holy Doctrine of the CATHOLICK CHURCH*; which thing Cardinal Capisucchi did not only know in his Conscience to be false, but had written the contrary to it, which I suppose he is willing should be thought the truer of the two.

But granting that the Bishop of Condom's words had been restrain'd wholly to the Council of Trent; Cardinal Capisucchi ought not to have Licensed or approved that Bishop's Exposition, if he would have approved himself a sincere Man: since he could not but know that this passage of the Bishop of Condom about Purgatory was a perfect Juggle, and altogether unbecoming a Christian, much more a Bishop; for tho' the Council had been so reserved about the nature of the Pains in Purgatory, yet he knew too well that their Church, their Catholick Church had plainly and fully determined about the nature of those Purgatory Pains in her Office for the Dead, by which she had spoken her sense intelligibly enough to the very meanest Capacities, that those pains are by FIRE, by FIRE which is the SAME with HELL-FIRE.

I will urge this thing no further, but only pray to God, that those great men may repent of such unwarrantable actions, and of such arts which are altogether a dishonour to our Holy Religion. I think I have very fully shewn what I did undertake for upon this business, to wit, that the Romish Purgatory is a place of Torment, wherein the Souls of those who are in it, undergo the same pains that the damned do, and that there is no other difference betwixt Hell-Fire and Purgatory-Fire, but



The Primitive Fathers no Papists.

that the One is Eternal, and the other but Temporal.

Having shewn all this so effectually from their approved Writers, from the Council of Florence, from the *Catechism ad Parochos*, and from the Office for the Dead in their *Romish Missal*, it would be the veriest loss of Paper, and the greatest affront to Readers of any sense, to set formally here to the shewing how inconsistent this *Romish Purgatory* is with the *Opinions* of the *Primitive Fathers* about the *State* of the *Deceased Faithful*, whom they believed to be (when they pray'd for them) in a *State of Comfort, Joy and Tranquillity*; if our *Compiler* be not convinced also by what I have proved here, that there is really no more agreement betwixt their *Purgatory* in the *Church of Rome*, and the *State of Bliss and Comfort* of the *Primitive Fathers*, than there is between *Light and Darkness*, betwixt *Torment and Pleasure*; I must tell him that I will never have any further to do with an *Adversary* that is obstinate and resolute not to be overcome; and therefore resolved not to be persuaded. I question not but this account of *Purgatory* that I have given from such unquestionable Authority in their *Church*, will no little discompose the *Compiler*, not only because it will ruine all he contended for about *Purgatory* in his *Vindication*, but for a nearer concern, because it shews, that the *Compiler* in giving such a contrary account of *Purgatory* in his *Vindication*, either did not know the *Doctrine* of his own *Church* about *Purgatory*, or did dissemble it, the first of which makes him *unable*, the second *unfit* to write about these things, since *Ignorance* or *Insincerity* are singly sufficient Bars against any Man's gaining Credit, that will notwithstanding set up for a Writer.

Notwithstanding that which I have already demonstrated about the *Romish Purgatory's Inconsistency* with any *Opinions* of the *Primitive Fathers* touching the *State* of the



the Faithful deceased, ought justly to supersede all further Controversie with the *Compiler* about *Purgatory*; yet since he offers something further in Defence of himself and his *Church*, I will consider it briefly. He says the *Primitive Fathers* did believe three States of Men gone off the Stage of this World, and that the middle State (to wit, of them who were neither very bad, nor very good) did suffer Temporal Punishment after their Death in order to their thorough *Purgation*. We enquire therefore from what *Fathers* he proves this, his Stock is small, and S. *Austin* is his only Author for all this, whom, of all the *Primitive Fathers*, he ought least to have insisted upon, since S. *Austin* is on every side, and is in for almost every of the different Opinions about the State of the Dead, as I could easily shew here, were it worth while. We grant S. *Austin* did talk of three States of Men after this Life; but must tell our *Compiler* withal that S. *Austin* was the First Father that begun this Distinction, and therefore it ought to be of no consideration herein, especially since it apparently contradicts the *Doctrines* of the Elder Fathers, who did look upon the Dead in the two Conditions only of Good Men, who were carried into *Abraham's Bosom*, and Wicked Men, who were hurried into the Place of Torments. This I made sufficiently apparent in my Answer to the *Nubes Testium*, particularly from S. *Chrysostom*, whose Third Homily upon the Epistle to the *Philippians*, doth evidently divide the Dead into Two States only; the *Righteous* whom he makes to go, immediately after they have left this world, to God, and to be possessed of Crowns and eternal Rest; and the *Wicked*, whom he places among the Damned, and looks upon their Judgments alike irreversible. But as S. *Austin* first talkt of Three Conditions of Men after Death, so we own that he talkt of Temporal Pains after this Life,

for

for the middle Condition of those departed Souls; yet all this will do the Church of Rome no Service for her Purgatory, since S. Austin is not only so very doubtful about any such Temporal Pains after this Life, which plainly shews it then to have been no Doctrine of the Catholick Church, but his Temporal Pains are wholly different from those of the Romish Purgatory.

Enchiridion  
ad Laurentium  
c. 69.

It is impossible to express any thing more doubtfully than he did this, *That there may be such a thing* (speaking of this his Notion about Temporal Pains for some after this Life) *is not incredible, and whether it be so or no, it may be questioned, and either be found out, or lye conceal'd.* And is not this a pleasant Account of that thing for which the Church of Rome pretends to the Tradition of the Catholick Church, and told the Greeks, at the Council of Florence, that she had this Doctrine delivered to her from hand to hand successively from S. Peter and S. Paul.

But these Temporal Pains S. Austin here spoke of are wholly different from those of the Romish Purgatory: that the Pains of the Romish Purgatory are by Fire, I have just now proved, whereas S. Austin's are no more (as is apparent from the preceding Chapter) than an intense Grief with which Men are afflicted or burnt for the loss of those things which they loved very much here on Earth.

\* ---Salvus est quidem, sic tamen quasi per ignem. Quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat amissarum. Idem ibid. c. 68.

The last Argument our Compiler hath for his Purgatory, which is rather insinuated than urg'd barefac'd, is, That since it is allowed the Fathers did pray for the Dead, it must be only for them who want Relief and are in Purgation, and neither for them who are in Heaven, nor for them who are in Hell, for the former of which they are needless, and for the other fruitless. And this is what F. Alexandre, our Compiler's Master, does speak out plainly. But

But to ruine this Conclusion, I will prove these two things, That the *Fathers* did pray for those they believed to be in Heaven; and That, *secondly*, they prayed for those in Hell.

For the Proof of my first I will make use of our *Compiler's* help, who brings in S. *Ambrose* praying for the Soul of the *Emperour Theodosius*, in his *Nubes Testium*, and will, I suppose, still yield it me, that the *Father* did pray for the *Emperour's* Soul. Now that S. *Ambrose* did at the same time believe that that *Emperour's* Soul was in Heaven, is evident beyond contradiction, since he does, in the same Oration, expressly affirm that the *Emperour's* Soul was then placed in the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, which all People own to be Heaven it self. I could prove further from the *ancient Liturgies*, that the *Prayers* of the *Church* were made for the best of Men, for the *Martyrs* themselves, whom they of the *Church of Rome* suppose to be in Heaven: but I need not stay to do it, however I will, to take notice of that Evasi-  
on which S. *Austin* hath taught them; who looking upon it as an absurd thing to pray for the *Martyrs* who were fitter to pray for us, and yet finding the *Liturgies* of the *Church* directly practising it, had no other way to answer the Practice of the *Church*, but by saying (as our *Compiler* quotes him) that the *Prayers of the Church*, when put up for such as *Martyrs*, were *Thanksgivings*, but for others were a *Propitiation*: which with all Reverence towards S. *Austin* is a *Fineness* of too bold, and too groundless a Nature, since had the *Church* intended only to praise God for the *Martyrs*, I question not but she would have made her Intentions plain enough, by putting down the *Praises* for the *Martyrs* as distinctly and as properly, as she would the *Prayers* for others. I must not forget to prove this also from that *Prayer* in the *Canon* of the *Mass* urged by our *Compiler*,  
wherein

wherein they pray not only for *those Servants of God, who have gone before them with the Seal of Faith, and rest in the Sleep of Peace, but for ALL WHO REST in CHRIST, which does comprehend all, even Martyrs as well as Saints, or Men of Lesser Sanctity, and as it includes Martyrs, it prays for those whom the Compiler and his whole Church believe to be in Heaven. But this Prayer is no more consistent with the Doctrines of the present Writers of the Church of Rome, than it is with the present Purgatory of that Church, which supposes the Faithful deceased to endure Fiery Torments in order to Expiation, whereas this very Old Prayer supposes them to rest in the Sleep of Peace.*

That they prayed also even for the *Damned* is plain, from S. *Chrysostom*, who in his above-quoted *Third Homily* upon the *Philippians*, did advise such Prayers upon this Perswasion, that tho' they could not obtain a Release for them from Hell, yet they would procure for them some Alleviation of Torments, some small Relief: and S. *Austin* himself seems to be for the same thing, when he speaks of the Prayers of the Living profiting so much, as either <sup>p</sup> to procure a compleat and full Remission, or that their Damnation should be made more tolerable.

Aut ad hoc  
profunt, ut sit  
plena Remissio,  
aut certe tolerabilior fiat ipsa

Damnatio. D. August. Enchirid. ad Laur. c. 110.

Our *Compiler* cavils (before he leaves this Point) very rudely at me for saying S. *Chrysostom* only advises the Oblation of *Alms* for the Increase of *Happiness* to his Son's Soul; and does very scornfully ask me what means S. *Chrysostom's* bidding him also pray for the discharge of his Son's Guilt? I can answer him without such rudeness in a very few Words, That the Increase of *Glory* was the sole Intention of his praying for the discharge of the Guilt of Sin: and that the latter was wholly design'd for the former.

Thus

Thus I have got through *that Chapter about Purgatory*, and have fixed all that I had proved before in my *Answer to the Nubes Testium*, that the *Fathers* neither knew of nor taught any *such Purgatory* as the *Church of Rome* doth, and therefore since they believed the *Romish Purgatory* no more than we of the *Church of England*, they are no more *Papists* than we are in this thing.

When he is come to the next great *Controversy* about *Transubstantiation*, he was resolved to divert himself, and his Reader, and in order to it by perverting of my sense to make himself sport. He pretends to be mightily at a loss what I would have the *Doctrine* of our Church to be about the *Eucharist*: and brings me in first saying, *Christ's Body is really present in the Eucharist*, then that 'tis the *Body of Christ Figuratively only*, but within four lines after, *that it is the Flesh and Blood of Christ ABSOLUTELY*, without any addition of really or figuratively: yet that in the next page 'tis not *Christ's True Natural Body*, but his *Figurative or Symbolical Body*. So that he says, *I play backward and forward in declaring the Doctrine of our Church, and make the Sacrament to be really Christ's Body, and yet to be Figuratively only* (that is, really not) *his Body*.

But does *this Man* believe himself in all this? Does he from his heart think that I am guilty of all this confusion and contradiction about this thing? I am well enough assured, that no *Man* of the least sense doth find such stuff in my *Book* it self, and therefore that the *Compiler* did not, but was forc'd to abuse my sense, and falsify my words, in order to his ridiculing of them and me. For as to the first passage about *Christ's Body being really present in the Eucharist*, it was occasion'd by my telling Him, that the *Controversy* betwixt the *Church of England* and *Rome*, is not about a *Real Presence*, which the *Church of England* did believe, when she looks up-

Q

on



on the *Consecrated Elements* not to be the *Body and Bloud of Christ themselves*, but to be appointed by God to exhibit to every *faithful Receiver* (not to every Receiver) *the Body and Bloud of Christ*. But for the *Consecrated Elements themselves*, she believes them to be **Figuratively only** *Christ's Body and Bloud*: the Reason of which I so often inculcated, because *BREAD and WINE CAN NO OTHERWISE BE THE BODY and BLOUD of CHRIST, AND BREAD STILL AT THE SAME TIME*; and therefore our *Compiler* ought to blush at his great disingenuity when he brings me in contradicting those very words within four lines of them, and says, I grant there, that *It* (that is, the *Sacrament*) *is the Flesh and Bloud of Christ ABSOLUTELY, WITHOUT ANY ADDITION of Really or Figuratively*: whereas any Man else would have carried my meaning along with him for so short a way as *four lines*, had I said so *absolutely, without any Addition of Really or Figuratively*: but this is absolutely false, for immediately after I had granted, as to *Justin Martyr's words*, that the *Consecrated Food* was the *Flesh and Bloud of Christ*, to prevent any such misinterpretation of my words, as the *Compiler* would make notwithstanding it, I added these very words: *However to corroborate what we said above* [which was, that the *Blessed Bread is the Flesh of Christ, but Figuratively only*] *it is evident to a Demonstration, that This Consecrated Food was still Bread, and NOT TRANSUBSTANTIATED into the Natural Body and Bloud of Christ*.

Did I here then say it was the *Flesh of Christ absolutely*, without any Restriction or Explication of my words and sense? Is this the Candour that becomes a Scholar? Is this the Sincerity that becomes a Christian? Is this the Veracity of a *Priest* of the Living God? Well, Well; If this be answering an *Adversary*, I perceive

ceive it is no matter whether it be true or false which we write, nor whether it be right or wrong which we assert, so that we secure our main design of ridiculing or abusing our Adversary.

That I might state the *Controversy* betwixt *us* and *Rome* aright in this great point, I shewed our Compiler that it was whether upon Consecration the Bread and Wine were transubstantiated into that very Body and Bloud of Christ which was nail'd and pour'd out upon the Cross, or whether after Consecration there is no other substance there but the Natural Body and Bloud of Christ. This I told him we expect they should prove, and that it is to no purpose to bring us only passages of the *Fathers* to shew, that they gave to the Consecrated Elements the Name and Appellation of the Body and Bloud of Christ, and that they said of the Elements, that they were Consecrated, made, or turned into the Body and Bloud of Christ, since we can demonstrate to them, that by the Body and Bloud of Christ which the Fathers said the Elements were made, they meant always *that* Body of Christ, which (in contradistinction to his *Natural Body* which he took from the *Virgin Mary*, and his *Mystical Body*, which is his *Church*) we call *Christ's Symbolical*, or *Figurative Body*.

And therefore Our *Compiler* is miserably out in his *Vindication*, when he thinks to carry his Cause by repeating only what he had put down more at large in his *Nubes Testium*, and by supposing the very words of *Body* and *Bloud of Christ*, sufficient Reply to all I had said in my *Answer* to the *Nubes*. I did not say only *this means*, and *that signifies only so and so*, as he would represent me to do in answer to any thing that did seem strong against us, but did all along give *my Reasons* for such things, till to repeat them further to the same

Objections, would have been more tedious to the Reader than me.

He talks as if the *Fathers* were clearly in their possession, and wholly on their side, and therefore that he need not much concern himself in confuting some untoward passages out of the *Fathers*, urged by us against *Transubstantiation*, since he supposes the *Fathers* are on their side, and would not contradict themselves: else surely we should find Him answering fairly to our Objections, as I had done to all his. But this is not the Man's way, tho' he is desirous it should be his Adversaries: but for himself he writes as if the *Controversy* had not made one step forwards betwixt us two.

But to let the World be judge also what a sort of an Adversary he is, I will very briefly run over his first Testimonies in the *Nubes*, and my answer to them, and shew how He does reply. To the passage from S. Ignatius, that the *Eucharist was the Body of Christ*, I answered that it was, but that it could be *Figuratively only so*, since *Bread could no otherwise be the Body of Christ and Bread still*; to this he makes no Reply. In Answer to the passage from the Council of Nice about not minding the *Bread and Wine before us*, but raising up our minds by Faith to consider the *Lamb of God offered by the Priests without shedding of Blood*, I shew'd him it meant only that *Communicants should by Faith represent to themselves the offering of the Lamb*, and that had he but transcribed on the rest of that passage out of his Master *Alexandre*, every one would have seen at first blush, that by the pretious *Body and Blood of the Lamb was not meant Christ's Natural Body*, but his *Figurative only*, since the *Communicants* are advised to take but a small portion of his *Body and Blood*; and that tho' it is sense to talk of receiving little or much of the *Elements*, yet that it is not sense to talk of taking a little or much of the *True Natural Body of Christ*.

To

To all which there is no Reply : and Reason good, since there was not room for any.

And when, in the next place, to explain a very obscure Passage in S. Hilary, I had produced a place that proved he did not believe any *Annihilation* or *Transubstantiation* of the *Elements*, since he says *it was Wine which they drank in the first Institution of the Eucharist*, the *Compiler* had nothing to reply with, and therefore runs back, and makes much adoe with the *obscure Passage*.

In answer to S. Cyril, he was told, that that very Passage (wherein the *Bread is said by Christ to be his Body*) was proof sufficient that Cyril did not believe *Transubstantiation*, since, as I had urged before, *Bread* can be *Christ's Body* only *Figuratively*. To this he gives no manner of Reply ; but when I had further answered that Cyril had spoken as lofty things of the *Chrism-Oyl*, as he does of the *Eucharist*, and that no Body, for all that did believe that the *Chrism-Oyl* was *Transubstantiated*, tho' he said it was no longer *bare* or *common Oyl* ; he asks me whether Cyril said that *Oyl is changed into the Body and Bloud of Christ* ? A Question so ridiculous, that I would forgive no Body the asking it me that had three Grains of Sense. S. Cyril, if this *Compiler* knew any thing of Him, does compare the Change in the *Eucharist* to this in the *Chrism-Oyl*, but I would feign know how the *one Change* does illustrate or prove the other ; when according to the wise *Masters* of the *Church of Rome*, the *one* is changed in its very Substance, but the *other* is not. It is a tedious thing to have to do with People that know nothing of the *Fathers* themselves, but by a little Quotation, which they make such a fluttering with, and as much noise as if they had read them through, and understood them as thoroughly.

To

To his next Authorities from Gregory Nyssen about the Body of Christ being received into our stomach, and making our Bodies Immortal by the Dispersion of the Sacrament into our several parts in order to their being cured of that poison which had affected every part, and made them Mortal. I shew'd him that this was directly against them, since this nourishing of our Bodies in a strict and proper sense cannot, without Blasphemy, be attributed to the Natural Body and Blood of Christ. All the Reply he makes to this, is to ask, *What need of nourishing here in a strict and proper sense?* My Answer is very ready, because this was the general opinion of the Fathers, That our Bodies are nourished with the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ. This I did abundantly clear in my *Expostulatory Letter* to Mr. Sclater of Putney, and made it the Instance of my *Second Corollary* against Transubstantiation in that Book, that to attribute a nourishing of our Bodies to the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ doth altogether exclude their being Transubstantiated into the Natural Body and Blood of Christ: and that the Fathers did attribute such a Nourishment of our Bodies to them, I proved from Justin Martyr, who did assert in plain terms, That our Flesh and Blood are nourished by the Consecrated Elements being changed into our Substance; from Irenaeus and Tertullian, That our Flesh is fed and nourished with the Body and Blood of Christ. I proved it from Origen, who says, That the Eucharist, as to its Material Part, goes into the Belly and is cast out into the Draught: from Isidore of Sevil, from Rhathramn, and from our Saxon Paschal Homily, which proves that the Eucharist is corruptible, for that it may be broke into several Pieces, grinded by the Teeth, and cast out into the Draught. I will add to these but one other Proof from Rabanus Maurus, who lived in the Ninth Century, and does not only tell us, That the Sacrament is made to nourish our Bodies;

Veteres Vindicati. p. 93, 94.



*Bodies<sup>9</sup>; and that as it is converted into us, when we eat and drink it, so we are converted into Christ's Body, when we live in a Godly Obedience: but he speaks of it in the Pœnitential (or Epistle, as Baluzius calls it) to Heribaldus as a thing not at all questioned that the*

*Sacrament, after it is received into our Bodies, is consumed, and cast out into the Draught: which he had Reason enough to think, since, as he speaks in the same Chapter, he did not believe that Body of Christ to be the same with the Body which was born of the Virgin Mary.*

And upon this I will beg leave to make a Digression to discover a double wrong done to this great Archbishop, by the Romish Publishers of his Works at Colen, 1627.

Finding the Passage, which I had just quoted, quite lamed, by being part of it rased out of that Manuscript, which Steuartius made use of in his Impression of Rabanus's Pœnitential among other Pieces: I had the Curiosity to enquire whether the Colen Edition of Rabanus's Works had this Passage entire, and whether those very Great Men, who had the care of that Edition, had been more successful than Steuartius in procuring an entire Copy of that 33. Chapter in the Pœnitential: But when I examined their Edition, I was surpris'd to find that their Edition did not only want that Passage, but that it wanted the whole Book. I found indeed in their Catalogue of the Tracts in every Tome, mention of Three Books to Heribaldus about Questions of the Canons touching Penance, but this Pœnitential was not there, but instead of it three Books upon the same Subject which were not his, but Halitgarius's, as Baluzius tells<sup>9</sup> us for a thing certain: so that here we find that which was certainly Rabanus's own Work quite left out, and that which was as certainly none of his obruded for his upon us.

<sup>9</sup> Sacramentum enim in alimentum corporis redigitur. — Sicut ergo in nos Id convertitur, cum Id manducamus & bibimus, sic & nos in Corpus Christi convertimur, dum obedientes & pie vivimus. Raban. Maur. de Institutione Clericorum, l. 1. c. 31. in Tom. 6. Edit. Colon. 1627.

Rabani Liber Pœnitentialis ad Heribaldum. c. 33.

<sup>9</sup> Præf. in Epist. Raban. ad Heribald. Edit. cum Regimine, Paris.

I cannot

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

I cannot but look upon all this as an industrious and contrived Piece of wrong, since such *Great and Learned Men* as *Pamelius*, and the *Bishop of Ipres*, and *Colverius* the *Regius Professour* and *Chancellour of the University of Doway*, who were jointly concern'd in taking Care of *this Edition of Rabanus's entire Works*, could not be all of them ignorant of *Rabanus's Pænitential*, being published in a Large *Quarto*, with other choice Pieces of *Ancient Writers*, by *Steuartius* at *Ingolstadt*, but just Ten Years before. I cannot but believe that the whole *Pænitential* was left quite out, and suffered this for the sake of the *Thirty third Chapter*, which was directly against *Paschasius's Doctrine*, and consequently against *Transubstantiation*.

The other wrong I have to complain of is, their leaving out too and depriving *Rabanus* of the *Traët* he wrote concerning the *Sacrament of the Eucharist*, and they are so careful not to have this discovered or suspected, that they do not so much as mention *this Traët* in their Catalogue of those Pieces of *Rabanus*, which they, after all diligent search, could not find in order to Print them with the rest of his Works, tho' afterwards among the Testimonies in favour of *Rabanus* we find *Arnoldus Wion* out of his *Second Book* concerning the *Archbishops of Mentz*, reckoning up, among *Rabanus's Writings*, A *Treatise de Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, and a little after, another *de Sacramento Eucharistia*, (which he rightly says was Printed at *Colen*, 1551.) over-against the mention of the *first Traët* indeed we find a *Marginal Note*, which will teach us what is become of that poor banished *Traët*, it is, that, in *Pamelius's Opinion*, that *Traët*, concerning the *Body and Bloud of Christ*, is *Paschasius Radbertus's Work*, and that it is accordingly extant among his Works: with this Information, I consulted *Paschasius's Works*, and there found this *Traët* had got a  
New

New Owner, *Sirmondus* having Printed it there as *his*, and all People, of the *Church of Rome* especially, concurring with him herein, so that *Mabillon*, in his *Preface* to the *Fourth Age* of the *Lives* of the *Benedictine Saints*, treating of *Paschasius's Works*, makes not the least scruple of *this Tract's* being *his*, and does but once mention its being Printed under *Rabanus's* own Name at *Colen*, 1551. but makes no reflection upon it.

However, notwithstanding *Paschasius's* being in present Possession of *that Discourse*, concerning the *Body and Bloud of Christ*, and *Sirmondus* and *Mabillon*, with the whole *Church of Rome*, (as I believe I may safely affirm it) looking upon it as undoubtedly *his*: I am very well satisfied that *this Tract* is *Rabanus Maurus's*, and that *Paschasius* has no Right at all to it, and will give the Reader the Reasons of that my Perswasion. The first of which is, That the *Manuscripts*, which I have seen, give it directly for *Rabanus*. I must begin with one *MS.* which I have not seen, that which did belong to *Cuthbert Tonstal Bishop of Durham*, from which *this Tract* was Printed at *Colen* the same Year, and by the same Printer, that Printed *Crabbe's Edition* of the *Councils*.

Joannes Quen-  
tel. 1551.

In that *MS.* as we see by the *Printed Copy*, it bore the Name of *Rabanus de Sacramento Eucharistia*: and so it doth in a very fine ancient *MS.* belonging to *S. John's College Library* in *Cambridge*<sup>1</sup>, where at the Top of the first Leaf we find *Rabanus's Name* set to it in *Three very different and very Old Hands*, and at the Head of every Leaf, almost of the whole *MS.* *his Name* is written, as if they were resolved to prevent any one's mistaking the Author of that *Tract*. And in another very ancient *MS.* which I met with in *Bennet College Library*, there it bears the same Title, and the *Tract* is thus entituled,

<sup>1</sup> *MS.* in folio,  
mark'd, A. 17.

This MS. is in the 303. Volume, according to Dr. James of Oxford's Catalogue of MSS. in Bennet Library, but is carelessly omitted by him, it is betwixt Guirmund and Austin's Tracts upon the same Subject, and should have been number 8. in that Volume.

**Hic incipit Rabanus de Corpore & Sanguine Christi**, and at the End of it, **Explicit Liber Rabanus**, which *false Latin* is so far from discrediting the MS. that all Learned Men will, on the contrary, own that it is a certain Evidence of the *Great Antiquity* of it.

But besides these MSS. vindicating this *Traict* to Rabanus, the very Passage at the Beginning of it in Sirmondus's Edition (upon which they conclude it so certainly to be Paschasius's) is evidently a *meer Patch* that does not agree with the rest.

In the *Colen Edition* of this *Discourse* from Bishop Tonstal's MS. and in both the *Cambridge MSS.* the *Preface* begins thus: *Dilectissimo Filio & Vice Christi præsidenti, Magistro Monastica Disciplina, alternis successibus veritatis Condiscipulo*, at the end of which Salutation every Body will allow me that *Salutem* is understood. Let me but put it down then there, and we shall next see how very finely this *Preface* runs in Sirmondus's Edition. Paschasius Radbertus Monachorum omnium peripsema Placido suo Salutem, Dilectissimo Filio & Vice Christi præsidenti, Magistro Monastica Disciplina, alternis successibus veritatis Condiscipulo Salutem. Is not here plainly two Salutations, and therefore two beginning of this little Epistle, which is just such a *Solecism*, as if a Man writing a short Letter to a Friend should begin, Dear Sir, To your self and all with you health in Christ, Dear Sir, To your self and all with you health in Christ. Which thing discovers not only that this beginning about Paschasius and his Placidus, is a downright Patch, that makes a gross Tautology at the very entrance of the *Preface*, but that he was a very Bungler that forg'd it, that could not invent something for his Paschasius to begin

gin with, which would sute with the rest of the Preface.

Another Argument I have against *Paschasius's* being the Author of this *Treat*, and for *Rabanus*, taken from the *Doctrine* of the *Discourse* it self; which will fully dispatch the *Controversie*. It is as known a thing that *Rabanus Maurus* did hold, that the *Sacramental Body* of *Christ* was different from the *Body* which he took from *Mary*, as that *Paschasius Radbertus* did hold, that they were both the very same. This we learn from the *MS.* of an *Anonymus* (which *Mabillon* hath since found out to be *Herigerus Abbot* of *Lob*) concerning the *Opinions* of these very men, in *Sidney College Library* in *Cambridge*: which tells us, that *Paschasius Radbertus Abbot* of *Corbey*, doth lay down from *S. Ambrose*, that the *Flesh* of *Christ* which is received from the *Altar*, is altogether no other than that which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, suffered upon the *Cross*, rose out of the *Grave*, and is daily offered for the *Life* of the *World*. Against whom both *Rabanus* doth sufficiently argue in his *Epistle* to *Abbot Elgio*, and one *Ratramnus*, in a *Book* made for *King Charles* [the *Bald*] saying, that the *Flesh* is not the same, either from the *Testimony* of *S. Hierom*, who says, that the *Body* of *Christ* is twofold, or from the *Authority* of *S. Austin*, who says, there is a *Threefold Body* of *Christ*.

\* — ponit ex Beati Ambrosii nomine, quod non alia plane sit caro quæ sumitur de Altari, quam quæ nata est de Maria Virgine & Passa in Cruce & quæ resurrexit de Sepulchro, quæq; pro mundi vitâ hodie offeratur. Contra quem satis argumentatur & *Rabanus* in Epistolâ ad Elgionem Abbatem, & *Ratramnus* quidam libro composito ad Karolum Regem, dicentes aliam esse vel testimonio Beati Jeronymi, qui dicit dupliciter dici Corpus Domini, vel ex auctoritate Sancti Augustini qui dicit tripliciter. *Liber de Sacramento MS.* in *Sidney Coll. Library*, in 4<sup>to</sup>. mark K. 3.6.

Here we find the *Opinions* of these two Men as opposite as the two *Poles*, and we find *Paschasius* so utterly against the *Opinion* of his *Adversaries* about a *Threefold Body* of *Christ*, that in his *Epistle* to *Fredugardus*, he warns him not to follow ineptias de tripartito Christi Corpore, those Fooleries about a *Threefold Body* of *Christ*. I



Quod tribus  
modis Corpus  
Christi appel-  
latur.

will then inquire with whether of these *two Men* the *Doctrine* of the *Treatise* contended for doth agree. Had *Sirmondus* but given us the *Chapters* of this *Treatise*, and the *Titles* of 'em as distinctly as *they* are in the *Colen Edition*, and in the *two Cambridge MSS.* the *Title* of the *15<sup>th</sup> Chapter* had decided this *business*, which is, *that the Body of Christ is so called three ways*; but tho' his *Title* does not, yet his *Chapter* doth prove as well as *ours* the distinction of a *Threefold Body of Christ*: and does begin with shewing, *that the Body of Christ is so called three ways*, or to make it more intelligible English, *that there are three Bodies of Christ*; which the *Chapter* divides and makes his *Myftical Body* the *Church*, his *Symbolical Body* the *Eucharist*, and his *Natural Body* which he took from the *Virgin Mary*.

Now who does not plainly see, that the *Doctrine* of this *Chapter* alone is directly contradictory to *Paschasius Radbertus's Doctrine*, who was not only against the distinction, but calls it foolery in his unquestioned *Epistle* to *Fredugardus*, and therefore that this *Traet*, which so formally asserts it, cannot be *Paschasius Radbertus's*. And on the contrary we see, that the *Doctrine* of this *Chapter* does exactly agree, and is the very same with what the *Manuscript* of *Herigerus* told us was the *Doctrine* of *Ra-*

*This is but what was the case of his other Traet left out by these people, which in Secuarius bears the name of Liber Poenitentialis ad Heribaldum, but Baluzius hath very well proved, that its true Title is, Epistola ad Heribaldum.* *banus* in his *Epistle* to *Abbot Elgio*, or *Egilo*, as others write it: And I must confess that this doth almost persuade me, that the *Traet* concerning the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*, and the *Epistle* to the *Abbot Egilo* are one and the same thing under two names: especially since I find that account from *Augustine* about the *Threefold Body of Christ*, which *Herigerus* tells us was urged by either *Rabanus*, in his *Epistle* to *Egilo*, or *Rathramn* against *Paschasius*, not in *Rathramn's Book* to *Charles the Bald*, but in this *15<sup>th</sup> Chapter* of this *Traet* almost word for word, as *Herigerus* afterwards puts it down in his *Traet*; but this only

only is a Conjecture, and let it pass as such. I am sure I have sufficiently proved, that *that Tract* which the *Romish Party* have ravish'd unjustly from *Rabanus*, was truly *his*, and not *Paschasius's*.

I will take the leave, now I am in at this sort of writing, to animadvert a little upon *Sirmondus's Notes*, upon *that Tract* in his *Edition* of *Radbertus*, because it will further corroborate what I have insisted upon here.

In the *Third Chapter* of *this Discourse* (according to *Sirmond's Edition*, for it is the 9<sup>th</sup> in the *Colem Edition*) *Rabanus* (for so I hope I may now call the *Author* of that *Treatise*) hath these Expressions about the *Sacraments* of the *Church*: *Now Christ's Sacraments in his Church are Baptism, Chrism, and the Body and Bloud of our Lord.* Upon this *Sirmondus* in his *Notes*, not finding here the *seven Sacraments* of his *Church*, but that *four* of them are disown'd, tells us very gravely, that *Paschasius mentions only three of the seven Sacraments of the Church for example sake only, and that it was not his business here to treat of the number of the Sacraments.* But this is not answering, but eluding the place, and to shew the Vanity of it: we will look into another of *Rabanus's Tracts*, and see whether he is not of the same mind, when he is professedly treating of the *Sacraments* of the *Church*. If we look then into his 24<sup>th</sup> *Chapter* of his *first Book* of the *Institution* of the *Clergy*, we do find him using the *very same Expressions*, and almost the *same numerical words* in his *Explication* of the *Nature* of *Sacraments* (which is another *Evidence*, that *this Tract* is really *Rabanus's*) and this too when he is instructing the *Clergy* professedly about the *Nature* and *Number* of the *Sacraments*; for in that *Book* having treated first of the *Unity* of the *Church*, and the *three Orders* of *Clergy* in the *Church*, and those under them, and of their *several habits*,  
he

he comes to treat (*chap. 24.*) of the *Sacraments* of the Church, and there it is that he says plainly, that the *Sacraments* are *Baptism, Chrism, and the Body and Bloud of our Lord*, after which having treated distinctly about every one of them, he says (*ch. 32.*) that having spoken sufficiently of the *Sacraments of the Church*, he would there pass on to discourse of the *Office of the Mass*.

*Rabanus* in the *41. ch.* of this *Treat* according to us (which is but the *15<sup>th</sup>* in *Sirmondus's Edition*) says in Explication of our Saviour's words, *Take and Drink of this All of you, as well Ministers as the rest of the Believers.* This Doctrine being expressly against their taking the Cup from the Laity, *Sirmondus* is very hard put to it in his Notes about it, and tells us, that *John of Lowvain, and Bellarmine and others*, think the place is abused; and that instead of, *Drink ye, it should be read, Eat ye*; well it shall be so to please those men; and now let's see how the period will run, *Take and Eat ye all of this, as well the rest of the Faithful as the Ministers, This is the Cup of my Bloud of the New and Eternal Testament*, which is very pleasant stuff, and therefore *Sirmondus* looking upon this emendation as too bold and unreasonable, has a better way to solve the difficulty, and that is, that the rest of the Faithful do indeed drink the Bloud of the Lord, but that they did not do it under the Species of Wine, but under the Species of Bread, by concomitancy, since they do not receive a Bloudless Body.

But to expose the violence of such an Interpretation of *Rabanus's* words, and to let all see how forced this is, we need only appeal to this Chapter it self, nay, to the bare Title it self (which I am afraid *Sirmondus* did for that reason omit) which tells us, that we do receive and offer at this very day no other Cup, but that which our Saviour himself took into his blessed hands at his last Supper: and there I hope *Sirmondus* will grant me, that our Saviour did

<sup>1</sup> Quod non alium calicem accipimus, & offerimus hodie, nisi quem ipse Jesus in suis Sanctis manibus accepit in Coena. Tit. c. 41.

did make use of a *real Cup*, and that He did give it *his Disciples* to drink, as the *Church* did, in *Rabanus's* time, give the *Cup* to all the *Faithful*.

I need make no Apology for this large Digression, since it is a Justice we owe to the Memories of those who did oppose *Transubstantiation*, when it was first started into the World, and since it disarms our Adversaries of One Weapon, which they use to employ against us, tho' it was really intended, by the Author of it, for us: but I did it chiefly because of that popular Argument so often in their mouths, which they use when ever they are urged with any Passage out of the *Fathers*, or *Church-Writers* against their *Transubstantiation*. We grant, cry they, that this Argument looks very promising for you, but, notwithstanding this, the *Father* is consistent with himself, and certainly for us, and was always lookt upon to be so: we'll give you an Instance of it, no Body hath written things so plausible for you, and which, at first blush, seem so perfectly inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*, as *Paschasius Radbertus* himself, in his *Treatise about the Body and Blood of our Lord*, and yet who ever doubted that *Paschasius* was of the contrary Opinion, and the *greatest Man* for *Transubstantiation* the *Church* ever had?

Thus we see what Feats may be done meerly by the supposing *this*, and *such Books*, to belong to *Paschasius*, and such as he, and how they carry the Cause, by looking upon *this Book* to be certainly *Paschasius Radbertus's*. For which very Reason, and that mentioned above, I have taken some pains here effectually to prove, that *this Treatise* was most certainly none of *Paschasius Radbertus's*, but does certainly belong to *Rabanus Maurus*, the *True Author* of it.

It



It is high time to return to my Friend, the *Compiler*, and the Business of *Transubstantiation*, and see whether he makes a better Defence for the rest of his *Fathers* for *Transubstantiation*, than for those hitherto. To the rest of his Quotations, from *Gregory Nyssen*, I shewed him that that *Father* does compare the Changes of the *Water* in *Baptism*, and the *Oyl* in *Chrism*, and the *Altar* at its *Dedication* to that of the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Eucharist*: which plainly shews he meant no more Change of the Substance of any one of *these*, than of the *rest*. What he says to this is nothing but confusion, I did not only prove that the *Water* and the *Oyl* have a *Virtue* from *Christ*, but that the *Father* said *they were changed* as well as the *Bread* and *Wine*, so that if the *Change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* was more than a *Change* of *Use* and *Quality* only, theirs must be so too, since he makes them all the *very same*: and it is too childish to urge that he does not say the *Water* and *Oyl* are *changed into the Body of Christ*, since we do see he asserts the *same Change* in them all: and what matters it that *he* does not determine into what?

He hopes next to secure *S. Chrysostom*, by saying, that I would fain evacuate all the plain and positive Testimonies of that *Father*, by a doubtful and obscure Passage out of his *Epistle to Cæsarius*. But I have too fully shewn in my Answer to repeat it here, That those Testimonies from *Chrysostom* were not plain, but very *Allegorical*, and not positive but very *Rhetorical*, as reasonable People of their own side, must own, that consider them. And for the Passage from *Cæsarius*, I urged that alone against them, because it was so *very plain* and so *positive* against *Transubstantiation*, and I will be judged by the Reader whether I needed (tho' I easily could have done it, and was prepared) to add any other Evidence to *It*, which  
runs



runs thus. For as [in the Eucharist] before the Bread is consecrated, we call it Bread; but after that by the Mediation of the Priest, the Divine Grace hath sanctified it, it is no longer called Bread, but is honoured with the NAME of our LORD'S BODY, THO' THE NATURE OF BREAD CONTINUE IN IT STILL. I cannot discommend the Compiler for calling it *obscure*, since it is the easier way to get rid of it, by saying so of it, than by answering it.

To his Quotation from S. Ambrose I answered fairly, by shewing him that S. Ambrose, when he was at the height of his Illustrations from Scripture, to prove a Change in the Sacrament, doth yet not only compare the Change in the Eucharist to the Change of a Man by Baptism, which every one owns is meerly a Change in Quality, but doth positively assert, That the Elements were what they were before Consecration, notwithstanding their Change into another thing; which Passage the Compiler dare not meddle with, but only says, *I give the pretended Authority of this Father against them.* But this is all the Man is able to say, and this is his way of trifling, when he hath nothing to answer fairly with. Whereas the Passage I quote is in the very same Book some of his own Quotations are taken from, and some of his Church were so sensible, that the Passage I make use of, is directly against their Transubstantiation, that they have struck part of it out of their Edition of S. Ambrose at Rome, which did entirely run thus, *If there be therefore so great Power in the Words of our Lord Jesus, as to give a Being to things which had none before, how are they not much more powerful to make that things may still be what they were, and yet be changed into another thing; which is quite altered by the Romish Edition, which makes S.*

" Si ergo tanta vis est in Sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quæ non erant: quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur, which last part the Roman Edition hath altered into, ut quæ erant in aliud commutentur. D. Ambros. de Sacramentis, l. 4. c. 4.

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

*Ambrose* to say, *How are they not more powerful to make, that those things which were, may be changed into another?* Which is a pretty way of getting the *Fathers* over to their Party.

After all he rallies up his scatter'd Forces, and shews them in a Body, calling the *Bread*, *Christ's Body*, and saying *it was changed into Christ's Body*; but since I have answered all that are out of genuine Authors already, and he has nothing farther to say for them, I need not stand to make any Reply, but refer the Reader to my *Answer*, wherein I had not only urged the *Doctrines of Antiquity*, but several *Practices out of It*, perfectly inconsistent with any Belief of *Transubstantiation*: but the *Compiler* was not so fair as to give one Word of Reply to them; but it is his way, and there is no hopes of getting him out of it.

In Answer to the *Chapter* about *Images*, he offers not one Word, but refers the Reader and me, to a whole *Discourse* (as he calls it) which he had published in Defence of that *Chapter*: But why must we be turn'd off to an Answer to a *Third Person*? Is all I have laid to the *Compiler's* Charge answered there? If it be not, To what Purpose am I sent thither? Well! To comply with this *shuffling Adversary*, I did look there, and all that I found was, that he can treat much *Worthier Persons* than I pretend to be, in the most contemptuous Manner. I had thought my finding out where he stole his Book, and publishing it to the World, had sharpened him more than ordinary against me, but by this Book I was convinc'd of my Mistake, for in it I found him treating the *Worthy Person* he was writing against, with the same opprobrious scornful Language, that he uses towards me. Another thing I did learn there, That this Man can, with a very good Grace, accuse others of that very thing which he is the most guilty in of  
any

any Writer that I know; he accuses that *Reverend Person* continually of *false stating*, and of *not stating* the *Controversie* about *Images*: and yet he himself (as I proved it upon him) hath not truly stated any *one Point* of *Controversy* (except that about *Invocation*) through his whole *Nubes Testium*; hath most falsely stated, for Example, *this about Images*, for whereas their *Council of Trent* hath decreed the *Worship* of *Images*, he states the Matter, as if the *Church of Rome*, and *second Council of Nice* were only for *giving Respect* to *Holy Images*: and yet when he is got into *his Cloud of Witnesses*, as if no Body could discover what he would be at, he fails to proving that the *Christians* did *not only adore the Cross*, but the *very Nails* of it, and which is more, that they were *commanded by the Law of God* to do it. Which were *strong Proofs* indeed, especially for the Times in which the *Authors* of them are said to have lived, but are such as shew there is *nothing so absurd* but that *some Men* will be found to assert it, and that there can be *nothing so absurd*, but that it will be swallow'd and quoted by such *Authors* as *Natalis Alexandre*, and our *Compiler*.

I had charged the *Compiler* with many other things, and his *Church*; not a syllable of which is answered in the *Discourse* I am refer'd to: I had challenged himself about the *Worship of the Cross*, and some other things, but he was wiser it seems than to accept my Challenge, or to trouble himself about that and *forty such things* laid to his charge: However, since he will not, I must then take leave to tell him, that *this* was not *vindicating* his *Nubes Testium*, but that his *pretended Vindication* does deserve the name of *some Cavilling Reflexions upon the Answerer to the Nubes Testium*, instead of that of an *Answer to Him*.

If he intends to make any further defence of himself against this *Reply*, I will tell him what scores he must

*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

clear, before I need to take further notice of *Him*. I have drawn up the *Catalogue* of near Forty considerable Charges against *Him*, which I must require him to reply to: and besides that, to go regularly through the *several Parts* of *this Reply to Him*, if he would acquit himself like a *Scholar*, or like an *Honest Man* in this *Controversie*: but above all things I must not forget to put him in mind of getting a *Chronology-Table*; the want of which hitherto hath done him such a scurvy deal of mischief: it will prevent his stumbling so often in those things, and will prevent some sharp Replies upon that account.

I have thus got through my *Vindication* of my self, and which I value much more, of the *Primitive Fathers*, and have made it further appear how far they were from joining with, or countenancing any of those *Practices* or *Doctrines* of the *Church of Rome*, set down by our *Compiler* in his *Nubes Testium*. As to the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, I had little to answer, since the *Compiler* had so little to say in his *Vindication* for it, but was forc'd to leave almost all I had urged from the *Fathers* against it, without once touching it, but only pickt at a place here and there. One of his little touches at me I had like to have slipt, I know not how, over; his saying, *I impose sillily upon the Reader, when in answer to the Objection made about no one's denying the Bishop of Rome's power of Excommunicating the Asiatics*, I had said, *Every Bishop might deny to communicate with any other Bishop or Church, against whom they had sufficient reason: As if (says he) denying to communicate were the same thing as to Excommunicate, to the doing of which an Authority or Jurisdiction over them who are Excommunicated is required, whilst refusing Communion may be done without any such power*. Well then *this Man* shall have his Will, and I therefore tell him, that by *denying Communion*, I meant a doing

a doing it *authoritatively*, that is, a putting the *other Bishop* from *them* by *Ecclesiastical Censure* : but I must also tell him, that an *Authority* or *Jurisdiction* over the *persons* to be *Excommunicated*, is not required, but that an *Equality of State* with the other persons is sufficient : and this of his is *dangerous Doctrine*, since every *Greek* can prove their *Bishops* of *Constantinople* to have *Jurisdiction* over the *Bishop* of *Rome* by this *Argument* since *Photius's* time, who did *Excommunicate* the then *Bishop* of *Rome*, and the *Bishops* of that *Church* do continue to *excommunicate* yearly to this day the *Bishop* and *Church* of *Rome* ; and not only the *Greeks*, but the *French Bishops* also, may by this *Argument* also be proved to be above the *Pope*, since they so long ago (as *Monsieur Talon* told the *Parliament* of *Paris* the other day) threaten'd the *Pope*, that if he came to *Excommunicate* them, He should be *Excommunicated* himself for meddling in things he had nothing to do with.

So that I suppose I shall hear no more of my imposing fillily about this thing, nor the *Compiler* have any thanks for his untoward *Observation*.

Such little things will not serve to build that *Supremacy* upon, which is pretended to by the *Bishops* of *Rome*.

And as the *Primitive Fathers* neither knew of, nor believed, nor therefore could submit to any *Supremacy* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* for the *first six Centuries*, so they were as far from the *Romish Doctrines* about *Tradition*, grounding all *Matters of Faith*, as we do, upon the *Holy Scriptures* ; and were as far from *Invocating Saints* as we of the *Church* of *England*, and from the *Belief* of *Purgatory* or *Transubstantiation*, and did detest the *Worship* of *Images* and *Reliques* as much as we can ; so that since in all these *Points* their *Doctrines* were contrary to the *Doctrines* of the *Church* of *Rome*, and their *Practi-*



*The Primitive Fathers no Papists.*

ees contrary to the present *Practices* of that *Church*, we are bound to vindicate *them* to the world, and to inform our *Readers* that *they* were no more *Papists* as to *those Points* mentioned by the *Compiler* in his *Nubes Testium*, than *we* of the *Reformation* are: and therefore I have Reason to conclude my *Defence*, as I did my *last Book* against the *Nubes*, with asserting it upon further Reasons, That the *Primitive Fathers* were no *Papists*.

THE END.

---

Books

---

## Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

**A** Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented] 4<sup>to</sup>.

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of CONDOM, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church.] 4<sup>to</sup>.

A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England; against the Exceptions of *Monf. de Meaux*, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. 4<sup>to</sup>.

A CATECHISM explaining the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome: With an Answer thereunto. By a Protestant of the Church of England. 8<sup>vo</sup>.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented, being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papist Misrepresented and Represented;] and a further Vindication of the CATECHISM, truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Lay-Christian's Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Plain Man's Reply to the Catholic Missionaries. 24.

An Answer to THREE PAPERS lately printed, concerning the Authority of the Catholic Church in matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the Church of England. 4<sup>to</sup>.

A Vindication of the Answer to THREE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the Catholic Church, and the Reformation of the Church of England. 4<sup>to</sup>.

Mr. Chillingworth's Book, called [The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation] made more generally useful by omitting personal Contests, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of Protestants, or defends the Church of England: with an exact Table of Contents, and an Addition of some genuine Pieces of Mr. Chillingworth's, never before Printed, viz. against the Infallibility of the Roman Church, Transubstantiation, Tradition, &c. And an Account of what moved the Author to turn Papist, with his Confutation of the said Motives.

An Historical Treatise written by an Author of the Communion of the Church of Rome, touching Transubstantiation: Wherein is made appear, That according to the Principles of that Church, this Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Protestants Companion, or an Impartial Survey and Comparison of the Protestant Religion as by Law established, with the main Doctrines of Popery: Wherein is shewn, that Popery is contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers and Councils; and that proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the ancient Fathers, for several hundred years, and the Confession of the most learned Papists themselves. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatise shewing that the Roman Church falsely claims to be that Church, and the Pillar of that Truth mentioned by S. Paul in his first Epistle to Timothy, chap. 3. ver. 15. 4<sup>to</sup>.

A Sermon preached on St. Peter's Day, published with Enlargements.

A short Summary of the principal Controversies between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, being a Vindication of several Protestant Doctrines, in answer to a late Pamphlet, intituled [Protestancy destitute of Scripture-Proofs.] 4<sup>to</sup>.

An Answer to a late Pamphlet, intituled [The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of England concerning one special Branch of the King's Prerogative, viz. In dispensing with the Penal Laws.]

A Discourse of the Holy Eucharist in the two great Points of the Real Presence, and the Adoration of the Host; in Answer to the Two Discourses lately printed at Oxford on this Subject: To which is prefixed a large Historical Preface relating to the same Argument.

## Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Two Discourses; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

The People's Right to read the Holy Scriptures asserted.

The Fifteen Notes of the Church, as laid down by Cardinal Bellarmine, examined and confuted. 4<sup>to</sup> With a Table to the whole.

Preparation for Death, being a Letter sent to a young Gentlewoman in France, in a dangerous Distemper of which she died. By William Wake, M. A. 12mo.

The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late Book, intitled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.* 4<sup>to</sup>.

A Private Prayer to be used in difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at London, Sept. 29. 1687. between A. Pulton, Jesuit, and Tho. Tenison, D. D. as also of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Vindication of A. Cressener, Schoolmaster in Long-Acre, from the Aspersions of A. Pulton, Jesuit, Schoolmaster in the Savoy, together with some Account of his Discourse with Mr. Meredith.

A Discourse shewing that Protestants are on the safer side, notwithstanding the uncharitable Judgment of their Adversaries; and that *Their Religion* is the surest way to Heaven. 4<sup>to</sup>.

Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist, wherein is shewed, That the Doctrine of Transubstantiation overthrows the Proofs of Christian Religion.

A Discourse concerning the pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*; with an Account of the Occasions and Beginnings of it in the Western Church. In Three Parts. With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of Condom.

The Pamphlet intitled, *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, or an Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, considered in its false Reasonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Answers, the first, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the second, to the Half-sheet against the *Six Conferences*.

A Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the new Exceptions of Monsieur de Meaux, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART: in which the Account that has been given of the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, is fully vindicated; the Distinction of Old and New Popery *Historically* asserted, and the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in point of *Image-Worship*, more particularly considered. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome: By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist.*] 4<sup>to</sup>.

Mr. Pulton considered in his Sincerity, Reasonings, Authorities: Or a Just Answer to what he hath hitherto published in his *True Account*; his *True and Full Account of a Conference*, &c. His *Remarks*; and in them his pretended Confutation of what he calls *Dr. T's Rule of Faith*. By Th. Tenison, D. D.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Ancient Church* relating to the Eucharist, wholly different from those of the *Present Roman Church*, and inconsistent with the Belief of *Transubstantiation*: being a sufficient Confutation of *Consensus Veterum*, *Nubes Testium*, and other late *Collections* of the *Fathers* pretending to the contrary. 4<sup>to</sup>.

An Answer to the *Representer's* Reflections upon the *State and View* of the Controversy; With a Reply to the Vindicators Full Answer; shewing, that the Vindicator has utterly ruin'd the New Design of *Expounding and Representing* Popery.

An Answer to the *Address* presented to the Ministers of the Church of England.

---

W. H. C. 1886

Aug. 3. 1886.

---